

1-1-1979

Pine tree politics : Maine political party battles, 1820-1972.

Whitmore Barron Garland
University of Massachusetts Amherst


Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation

Garland, Whitmore Barron, "Pine tree politics : Maine political party battles, 1820-1972." (1979). *Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014*. 1907.
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/1907

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

UMASS/AMHERST



312066013538406

PINE TREE POLITICS
MAINE POLITICAL PARTY BATTLES, 1820-1972

A Dissertation Presented

By

WHITMORE BARRON GARLAND

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

February

1979

Political Science



Whitmore Barron Garland

1979

All Rights Reserved


PINE TREE POLITICS
MAINE POLITICAL PARTY BATTLES, 1820-1972

A Dissertation Presented


By

WHITMORE BARRON GARLAND


Approved as to style and content by:




Dr. John H. Fenton, Chairperson of Committee



Harvey L. Friedman, J. D., Member



Dr. James Wright, Member



Dr. Glen Gordon, Department Head
Political Science

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

An effort of this kind requires the help of many. It is impossible to thank them all. I appreciate the assistance of John H. Fenton, who provided the inspiration and direction. The other members of my committee, Harvey Friedman and James Wright, made comments and suggestions that were well taken.

I am also grateful for the help of the library staffs of Bowdoin College, the University of Maine, and the University of Massachusetts.

But most especially the debt is to my family. This would not have been completed without the encouragement and assistance of my wife, Rosemary. My daughter, Jean, provided loyal support and concern.

ABSTRACT

PINE TREE POLITICS

MAINE POLITICAL PARTY BATTLES, 1820-1972

February, 1979

Whitmore Barron Garland, B.A., Bowdoin College

M.A., University of Maine; Ph.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Professor John H. Fenton

As the title indicates, this dissertation has approached the Maine political scene from two different perspectives. The first approach utilized the historical narrative and attempted to place the political party development in Maine in historical context. The major thrust is to examine major periods of control by one or the other of the major parties. Little is found in the party control pattern or county voting patterns to explain current political trends, but Maine's politics were found to be both personality and issue-oriented.

The second perspective focuses on the period from 1952 to 1972 when Maine, by most standards, became a competitive two-party state for the first time. The attempt was made to discover the reasons for the state's change to a two-party system. This was done through the examination and correlation of socio-economic changes in the state with county voting statistics for statewide elections for President, U. S. Senator, and governor.

An examination of the vote for the period under study yielded a ranking of the counties in support of Democratic candidates and a rate of change for each county for each type of election. The data showed that the pattern of change toward a two-party system differed with each election type. The change from the dominant one-party Republican state to a competitive, two-party state did not occur uniformly or consistently across the series of elections under study. An analysis of the voter registration data showed that, although the 1954 Muskie election as governor has been regarded as the breakthrough election for the Democratic Party, major changes in voter registrations favorable to the Democratic Party did not occur until the early 1960's. A large segment of the electorate in Maine has traditionally been Independent, apparently providing a refuge for Democrats during the earlier part of the period and acting to provide a means of Republican support of Democratic candidates in later stages.

Twenty-nine socio-economic variables, taken primarily from the United States Census for 1950 to 1970, were correlated with the percentages of the Democratic vote in twenty-two statewide elections from 1952 to 1972 for Maine's sixteen counties.

It was found that ethnicity, represented primarily by foreign stock, the per cent of the population that is Catholic, and urbanism correlated highly with the per cent of the vote that was Democratic. The correlations were highest for the Democratic presidential candidates, followed by Democratic candidates for governor and U. S. Senator.

The examination of the rate of change of the Democratic vote

for each office revealed that for elections for President and Senate support has come somewhat from traditionally Republican areas, particularly from the coastal counties. Increased support for Democratic gubernatorial candidates has come from the traditionally Democratic areas. The supposition was advanced that presidential elections tended to be issue-oriented, and senatorial elections tended to be personality-oriented, while the governors' races were more akin to political party contests.

Multiple correlations using the socio-economic variable of foreign stock, urbanism, and Catholicism gave a multiple correlation of .906. This means that the three variables could explain 82 per cent of the variance in the average Democratic vote for the period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	iv
ABSTRACT	v
Chapter	
I. THE POLITICAL CONDITIONERS	1
Geography	2
Population	4
Economic Characteristics	10
Social Characteristics	13
Political Institutional Factors	22
II. A BRIEF HISTORY	26
The Beginning	26
Control by the Democrats - 1830-1854	39
The Republican Ascendancy - 1856-1954	47
The 1910-1914 Interlude	55
Democratic Victories of the 1930's	66
III. THE MOVE TOWARD COMPETITIVE PARTIES	81
The Changeover	81
The Rate of Political Change	98
Voter Registrations	102
IV. THE SEARCH FOR DEMOCRATIC STRENGTH	110
Introduction	110
An Analysis of the Socio-Economic Variables	111

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Con't.)

	<u>Page</u>
An Analysis of the Election Variables	116
The Findings	122
The Change Variables	140
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	145
Introduction	145
Maine's Status as a Two-Party State	149
Maine's Politics - Nationalized or Regionalized?	153
The Roles of the Independent Voter	162
The Socio-Economic Variables	166
BIBLIOGRAPHY	172
APPENDIX A	180
APPENDIX B	192

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
1. Maine Population, 1970, Place of Residence	6
2. Large Rural Non-Farm Populations, 1970	7
3. Rural Farm Population, 1970	8
4. Comparison of Employment, 1970, Maine and the United States	10
5. Leading Manufacturing Counties, 1970	12
6. Foreign Stock Components, Maine Population, 1970	15
7. Location of Foreign Stock Population in Urban Areas, Maine, 1970	16
8. French-Speaking Population, Towns and Places, 10,000-50,000 Population	17
9. Democratic-Republican Victories in Governor, Senate, and House Races, 1820-1830	37
10. Democratic Victories in Governor, Senate, and House Races, 1830-1854	40
11. Support of Republican Candidate for President, 1856	46
12. Republican Victories in Governor, Senate, and House Contests, 1856-1954	48
13. Analysis of Votes For Governor, Maine, 1904-1916	58
14. Comparison of Vote 1906-1916, State and Selected Counties, Per Cent Vote for Democratic Candidate for Governor	65
15. Analysis of 1924 Election of Governor	70
16. Comparison of Periods of Democratic Success by County	78
17. Pattern of Democratic Support, 1932-1952, Selected Counties	80
18. Democratic and Republican Victories in Governor, Senate, and House Contests, 1952-1972	85
19. Rank Order, Average Democratic Vote by Per Cent, State-wide Offices, 1952-1972	87

LIST OF TABLES (Con't.)

	<u>Page</u>
20. County Support for Democratic Candidates, Statewide Elections, 1952-1972	88
21. Change in Democratic Vote, State, 1952-1972	98
22. Comparisons of Rate of Change, Democratic Vote, State-wide Elections, 1952-1972	100
23. Democratic and Republican Voters, Total Voter Registration	103
24. Enrolled and Independent Voters, Gains and Losses, Selected Elections	105
25. Composite Voter Enrollments, Rates of Change by County	107
26. Inter-Correlations of Measures of Ethnicity	112
27. Interrelationships of Variables Measuring Change in Population Characteristics, 1960-1970	116
28. Senatorial Election Consistency, 1952-1972	118
29. Gubernatorial Election Consistency, 1952-1972	119
30. Consistency of Elections	121
31. Presidential Elections - Ethnicity, 1952-1972	123
32. Presidential Elections - Urbanism-Manufacturing, 1952-1972	125
33. Presidential Elections - Income, 1952-1972	127
34. Presidential Elections - Catholicism, 1952-1972	129
35. Senatorial Elections - Ethnicity, 1952-1972	130
36. Senatorial Elections - Urbanism-Manufacturing, 1952-1972	132
37. Senatorial Elections - Income, 1952-1972	133
38. Senatorial Elections - Catholicism, 1952-1972	134
39. Gubernatorial Elections - Ethnicity, 1952-1972	136

LIST OF TABLES (Con't.)

	<u>Page</u>
40. Gubernatorial Elections - Urbanism-Manufacturing, 1952-1972	137
41. Gubernatorial Elections - Income, 1952-1972	138
42. Gubernatorial Elections - Catholicism, 1952-1972	139
43. Change Variable Correlations	141
44. Per Cent Change in Presidential Elections	143
45. Maine's Classification as a Two-Party State	151
46. Multiple Correlations for the Average Democratic Vote, 1952-1972	169

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	<u>Page</u>
1. Democratic Vote, All Elections, 1952-1972	91
2. Democratic Vote, All Elections, Selected Counties and State, 1952-1972	92
3. Democratic Vote For President, State and Selected Counties, 1952-1972	94
4. Democratic Vote For U. S. Senator, State and Selected Counties, 1952-1972	95
5. Democratic Vote For Governor, State and Selected Counties, 1952-1972	96
6. Comparison of Composite B, Democratic Vote and Democratic Voter Registrations, 1954-1970	156
7. Comparison of Independent Votes, State and Nation, 1954-1974	164

Map

1. Democratic Support by County, All Elections, 1952-1972	89
2. Rate of Change in Democratic Vote, All Elections, 1952-1972	101

CHAPTER I

THE POLITICAL CONDITIONERS

In 1964, Professor David B. Walker, in a publication of the Bowdoin College Bureau of Research in Municipal Government, wrote:

In terms of party advantage, the dominant socioeconomic features continue to favor the majority party. Witness the strength of rural non-farm, small town, older, Protestant homeownership, small entrepreneurial, and servicing sectors of the electorate. The corresponding weaker position of the young, the larger towns and the cities, Catholic and Jewish minorities, trade unions, and large industry hurt the Democrats, since these are the socioeconomic bases that usually favor this party. Not to be overlooked here is the fact that many of Maine's dominant social characteristics frequently override strictly economic considerations and result in a suppression of the politics of class.¹

Professor Walker, even ten years following the Democratic breakthrough of the early 1950's, did not consider the possibility of a competitive, two-party system for Maine to be immediate. He went on, however, to hedge for he said that a number of long term developments were at work that would provide a social basis for a two-party

¹David B. Walker, A Maine Profile: Some Conditioners of Her Political System, Government Research Series No. 25, Bureau for Research in Municipal Government (Brunswick, Bowdoin College, 1964), p. 24.

system. These were urbanization, an increase in the number of salaried workers, low levels of personal and family income, the problem of economic expansion, and an increasing number of newer mass media outlets.²

In spite of Walker's pessimism, Maine's politics has, by most observations, reached the two-party level; and it did so within the time frame for which Walker was writing.

The purpose of this chapter will be to examine, in limited detail, the general economic and social characteristics of the state of Maine and its population. This will provide a framework for discussion of the changes that have occurred and are occurring in the state's political party system.

Geography

The relatively isolated position of Maine has been noted by many. It is the easternmost state in the United States, bordering only upon New Hampshire. Maine's other borders are with Canada and the Atlantic Ocean. Maine's geographical position has had an effect in at least two areas. It has contributed to the reserve and the resistance to change that is characteristic of the population. Further the state's location "at the end of the line," has impeded economic growth because of distance from central markets and the cost of transporting raw materials and finished products.

Maine is also relatively large. Its area of 33,215 square

²Ibid., p. 25.

miles nearly equals the area of the other New England states combined, although it ranks only 39th among the states. Approximately one-tenth of its total area is water, with approximately 2,500 lakes and ponds and 5,000 rivers and streams. Maine's rugged coastline measures 3,500 miles. Four of Maine's rivers are navigable for considerable distances inland and were explored very early in our history. Ten of Maine's counties have access to water traffic. Maine's location and climate favors the development of water power because the river sources are high above sea level and there are numerous natural waterfalls assured of a constant flow by sufficient rainfall of 40 to 46 inches annually.

Eighty-nine per cent of Maine is forested, and this figure has grown in recent years. Maine's soil varies greatly in fertility with gravelly loam, sand, clay loam, heavy clay, and finally to the rich Caribou loam that has made Aroostook County famous as a potato-growing area.

Maine has a healthful and invigorating climate characterized by changeable weather with ranges of temperature from region to region and seasonal. Regional climatic influences are modified by differences from the ocean, elevations and types of terrain, dividing the state into three parts, the northern, coastal and southern interior divisions.

Maine has limited mineral resources, in quality if not in quantity, which has retarded development. Most of its developed mineral resources have been non-metallic. Granite, feldspar, and limestone are long established industries. Beds of clay widespread over the state

have been used in the manufacture of brick in many localities.³

Population

Maine became a state in 1820 with a population of 298,335 divided 2.9 per cent urban and 97.1 per cent rural. In 1970 the corresponding figures were: population 992,048 with 50.8 per cent urban and 49.2 per cent rural.⁴ The period of greatest growth occurred in the years up to 1850, with the population increasing only about 70 per cent since that time.

Maine's six southwestern counties account for 56.1 per cent of its total population and show an average population increase over the previous decade of 5.2 per cent. The four northeastern counties have shown an average loss of 6.9 per cent.⁵ The statewide population change is 2.5 per cent, the lowest of this century. There has been a

³Two good general sources of information about Maine are Dorris A. Isaacson, Maine: A Guide Downeast, 2nd edition (Rockland: Courier-Gazette, Inc., 1970); and Jim Brunelle, ed., Maine Almanac (Augusta: Guy Gannett Publishing Company, 1978). The Courier-Gazette, Inc., also publishes annually the State of Maine Facts. The Maine Department of Economic Development has published two editions of Maine Pocket Data Book: An Economic Analysis.

⁴U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census. United States Census of Population: 1970, Vol. 1, Characteristics of Population, pt. 21, Maine, p. 7.

⁵The six southwestern counties are: Androscoggin, Cumberland, Kennebec, Oxford, Sagadahoc, and York. The losing northeastern counties are Aroostook, Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Washington. See Appendix A for a summary of population characteristics by county.

steady decline since the 1950 census.⁶ A large 71.3 per cent of Maine's urban population, which is 50.9 per cent of the total, resides in places of 2,500 to 25,000, a slight 2.4 per cent increase over 1960. Only 27.8 per cent of the urban population lives in places of 25,000 to 100,000.⁷ The nationwide population increase from 1960 to 1970 was 13.3 per cent with a corresponding urban population of 73.5 per cent.⁸

Maine's population has a median age of 28.7, slightly older than the national figure of 27.9.⁹ Six counties have more than 13 per cent of their population over 65, with the corresponding state figure of 11.5 and nationally 9.8 per cent.¹⁰

Many observers have noted that Maine's population is a small town population. As Table 1 indicates, more than half of the population lives in places of 1,000 to 10,000 persons. Maine's urbanized areas consist of Portland, the largest city, and the combined area of Lewiston-Auburn.

⁶U. S. Census, 1970, p. 5.

⁷Ibid. There are only three cities in this category: Portland, Lewiston, and Bangor. Portland and Bangor have suffered decline in population, while Lewiston has had an insignificant increase.

⁸U. S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1976, pp. 13, 16.

⁹Ibid., p. 6. Also, U. S. Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book, 1972, p. 222.

¹⁰County and City Data Book, 1972, p. 222. Statistical Abstract, 1976, p. 6. The counties are Hancock 14.3, Knox 16.0, Lincoln 15.6, Piscataquis 13.5, and Washington 15.0.

TABLE 1

Maine Population, 1970
Place of Residence

Urban (504,157)	50.9%
Urbanized Areas	34.1
Central Cities	25.6
Urban Fringe	8.4
Other Urban Places	
10,000 to More	29.4
2,500 to 10,000	36.9
Rural (487,891)	49.1
Places 1,000 - 2,500	17.4
Other Rural	82.6

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1970, p. 16.

Much of Maine's population is parochial in the sense that its people were born here and have stayed here. A large 79.6 per cent of the population was born in Maine and an additional 11.9 per cent came from some part of the Northeast.¹¹ Ten of the counties, led by Somerset with 87.0 per cent, have better than 80 per cent of its population born in Maine. Only York County with 67.3 per cent of its population born in Maine does not fall near the statewide level.¹²

Although nearly half of Maine's population is classified as

¹¹U. S. Census, 1970, p. 110.

¹²Ibid., p. 115.

rural, only a small portion of the rural population is classified as rural farm. A very small 4.7 per cent of the rural population are farmers, whereas 95.3 per cent of the rural population are classified as rural non-farm.¹³ These are not the same populations as Table 2 and Table 3 indicate.

TABLE 2

Large Rural Non-Farm Populations
1970

<u>County</u>	<u>Per Cent of Population</u>
Lincoln	97.4
Hancock	85.7
Washington	84.3
Franklin	82.1
Piscataquis	78.2
Oxford	75.1

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1970, pp. 236-241.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 236-241.

TABLE 3

Rural Farm Population
1970

<u>County</u>	<u>Per Cent of Population</u>
Waldo	7.2
Aroostook	6.3
Somerset	4.3
Franklin	4.0
Knox	3.2
Oxford	3.0

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1970, pp. 236-241.

Comparing the two tables, only Franklin and Oxford Counties appear as having both a large per cent of rural non-farm and rural farm populations. Maine's farm population declined by 52.6 per cent in the decade of the 1960's with a 38.1 per cent reduction in the number of farms and a 32.1 reduction in total acreage.¹⁴ Four of the five counties showing the greatest farm population losses, Hancock, Lincoln, Washington, and Piscataquis, led the list of counties with a large rural non-farm population.¹⁵ It is a fairly common sight in rural Maine

¹⁴County and City Data Book, 1972, p. 232.

¹⁵Ibid.

to see farms abandoned, both as productive units and as living units. A further interesting fact in terms of the urban-rural basis of population is that a number of counties lost urban population, but gained rural population, a situation similar to the depression years of the 1930's.¹⁶

In terms of education, Maine compares favorably with the nation with one exception, that of per cent of population with four years of college or more. The states median number of years of school completed 12.1 is nearly identical to the national figure of 12.2. The 54.7 per cent of Maine's population 25 years or older that has completed four years of high school or more is 20 per cent more than the national figure of 34.0 per cent. Only four of Maine's counties, Androscoggin, Aroostook, Somerset, and Washington, have less than half of their populations completing four years of high school. Nationally, 11.0 per cent of the population has completed four years of college or more, whereas Maine's percentage is only 8.4. Only Cumberland County with 11.6 per cent and Lincoln County with 10.3 per cent approach the national average.¹⁷

¹⁶U. S. Census, 1970, p. 16. Androscoggin, Cumberland, Knox, Oxford, Penobscot, Waldo, and Washington Counties lost urban population, with Washington, 40.2 per cent, and Oxford, 31.2 per cent leading. Androscoggin and Cumberland counties led with rural population gained with 46.8 per cent and 22.2 per cent respectively. Twelve counties had rural population gains.

¹⁷ The state figures are from County and City Data Book, 1973, p. 223 and U. S. Census, 1970, p. 125. National figures are from Statistical Abstract, 1976, p. 123.

Economic Characteristics

Maine is generally thought of as being economically dependent on farming, fishing, and tourism; but, in recent years, its economy has nearly approximated that of the country as a whole. The major employment categories are compared in the following table.

TABLE 4

Comparison of Employment, 1970
Maine and the United States

<u>Employment Category</u>	<u>Maine Per Cent</u>	<u>United States Per Cent</u>
Manufacturing	31.6	27.2
Wholesale & Retail Trade	19.5	21.2
Government	15.2	17.8
Services	14.9	16.4
Construction	6.3	4.9

Does not total 100 per cent because
not all employment categories were
considered.

Source: County and City Data Book, 1972, p. 224. Pocket Data Book USA, 1976, pp. 163-164.

The major difference in Maine's employment profile and that of the country as a whole is the per cent of workers employed in manufacturing, but more recent figures (1975) show Maine's percentage to be only 26.9.¹⁸

A further comparison, using 1976 figures, shows the value of products manufactured by Maine's industry was 4.2 billion.¹⁹ Five industries dominate manufacturing in the state: pulp and paper, food processing, leather goods, lumber-wood and textiles. By comparison, the total value of Maine's agricultural, fishing, and tourism industries was about 1.2 billion.²⁰

Maine's leading manufacturing counties, in terms of employment in manufacturing, can be seen in Table 5.

The retail and wholesale trade centers are regional in nature. In addition to Cumberland, with Portland as the leading trade and financial center of the state, the centers are Aroostook, Penobscot, and Knox.²¹ Cumberland, Kennebec, Penobscot, Sagadahoc, and Hancock have the largest number employed in white collar occupations, ranging from 50.2 per cent in Cumberland to 40.2 per cent in Hancock.²²

¹⁸Maine Almanac, p. 222.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 225.

²⁰Ibid., p. 226-228.

²¹County and City Data Book, 1972, p. 224.

²²U. S. Census, 1970, p. 115.

TABLE 5

Leading Manufacturing Counties
1970

<u>County</u>	<u>Per Cent Employed</u>	<u>Major Products</u>
Franklin	49.4	Pulp & Paper, Wood Product
Oxford	48.3	Lumbering, Pulp & Paper Leather
Somerset	47.3	Lumbering, Wood Products
York	44.2	Textiles, Machinery
Piscataquis	43.3	Pulp & Paper, Leather
Androscoggin	41.4	Shoes, Textiles, Pulp & Paper
Sagadahoc	39.4	Shipbuilding, Iron Products, Wood

Source: County and City Data Book, 1972, p. 234; Maine Almanac, pp. 41-58.

Maine does not appear wealthy by its income levels. It ranks 36th in the country with a median income of \$8,205, compared to a national figure of \$9,867. At the lower end of the scale, Maine is close to the national average, 10.3 per cent to 10.1 per cent nationwide, in the per cent of its population with income below the poverty line, but two of its counties, Washington with 19.0 per cent and Aroostook with 16.3 per cent must cope with substantial poverty, particularly rural

poverty. Seven of its other counties exceed the national figure.²³

By far, the greatest income differences between Maine and the rest of the country arise in the upper end of the scale. Although nationally 22.3 per cent of the working people receive incomes of \$15,000 or over, only half that amount, or 11.2 per cent do so in Maine.²⁴ Four counties, Cumberland, Kennebec, Penobscot, and York exceed the state figure, and only Cumberland with 16 per cent approximates the national number. Income levels, because of a lack of spread, apparently are not the factor in politics in Maine that they are elsewhere.

Social Characteristics

Much has been written concerning the role of the Franco-Americans, Maine's largest minority group, in Maine's political life. It is generally considered that Maine's population growth from 1870, in face of continuing net loss due to interstate migration has been attributable to immigration, primarily from Canada. A heavy influence of migrants from Canada between 1870 and 1930 can be said to account for more than half of Maine's population growth.²⁵

²³Ibid. Statistical Abstract, 1976, pp. 404-409. Hancock, Knox, Lincoln, Piscataquis, Sagadahoc, Somerset, and Waldo all have higher percentages of persons with income below the poverty line.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Walker, A Maine Profile, p. 12.

English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians came to Maine in roughly equal numbers, at least until 1940. The English-speaking Canadians, whose language customs and religion permitted easy assimilation have generally become a part of the Yankee society. The French-speaking Canadians, however, through their customs, culture, and religion, together with their pattern of settlement, have tended to remain apart.

Politically the Franco-Americans have become loyal Democrats, particularly since the mid and late 1920's. Earlier, perhaps from 1896 to 1924, they may have voted Republican, through pressure from the mill owners, antipathy from Irish Democratic leadership, or acceptance of the more conservative political philosophy and economic doctrines.²⁶ Since the 1928 presidential election, the Franco-American communities have tended to vote for the Democratic Party.

Maine's foreign stock portion of its population was 192,760 in 1970, or 19.4 per cent of the total population. This includes 149,746 of foreign or mixed percentage and 42,014 foreign born.²⁷ A breakdown of the foreign stock population into its major components occurs in Table 6.

²⁶David Walker, "The Presidential Politics of the Franco-American," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 28 (1962): 356-363.

²⁷U. S. Census, 1970, p. 116.

TABLE 6

Foreign Stock Components
Maine Population, 1970

<u>Country</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per Cent of Total Foreign Stock</u>
Canada	136,801	71.0
United Kingdom	12,075	6.3
Ireland	6,528	3.4
Italy	6,083	3.2
Germany	4,488	2.3

Does not total 100 per cent.²⁸

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970, p. 116.

Foreign born, which totals 43,104 in the state and equals 4.3 per cent of the population, follows the pattern of foreign stock in most instances. Canadian migrants make up 72 per cent of the total, and 43.2 per cent have French as a mother tongue.²⁹ The foreign born are considerably older than either the general migrant population or the state population as a whole, having a median age of 61.1 years and with 66 per cent over 50 years of age.³⁰

²⁸Total is 86.2 per cent; USSR, 1.5 per cent; Sweden, 1.4 per cent; and Poland, 1.3 per cent are the next largest categories.

²⁹U. S. Census, 1970, p. 121.

³⁰Ibid., p. 255.

Of Maine's foreign stock, 63.1 per cent has settled in the urban areas. The following Table, Table 7, shows the breakdown.

TABLE 7

Location of Foreign Stock Population in Urban Areas
Maine, 1970

<u>Location</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Central Cities	30.5
Urban Fringe	7.1
Places 10,000 or More Population	31.6
Places 2,500 to 10,000	30.9

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, p. 142.

The French-speaking population is not identical with the foreign stock, but there is a similar settlement pattern. The French-speaking population makes 14.2 per cent of the total population, but 20.7 per cent of the urban population to only 7.5 per cent of the rural population.³¹ More than half of the French-speaking population can be found in the eleven communities shown in Table 8.

³¹U. S. Census, 1970, pp. 121-122.

TABLE 8

French-Speaking Population
Towns and Places, 10,000-50,000 Population

<u>Towns and Places</u>	<u>Total Population</u>	<u>Per Cent of Population French-Speaking</u>
Biddeford	19,983	61.4
Lewiston	41,779	59.9
Sanford	15,722	38.1
Waterville	18,192	30.0
Augusta	21,945	29.2
Auburn	24,151	28.7
Saco	11,678	28.5
Caribou	10,419	23.7
Westbrook	14,444	17.2
Brunswick	16,195	15.4
Presque Isle	11,452	13.8

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, pp. 184-185.

A number of smaller communities, particularly in the St. John river valley in Aroostook County, in Androscoggin and Oxford County mill towns, and in York County have substantial percentages of the French-speaking population.

The eleven communities represented in Table 8 have a total of

90,154 registered voters. A total of 63,680, or 70.6 per cent, are registered Democrats.³² The Franco-Americans have made a substantial contribution to the Democratic Party of Maine.

Closely related to, but by no means identical to, the French-Canadian population is the religious factor in state politics, Catholicism. In fact Maine is the only New England state that has a Catholic presence rooted in the colonial period. The first Jesuit mission in North America was established on Mount Desert Island in 1613.³³ The French Catholic influence continued to be felt throughout the colonial period through French control of land later to become part of Maine and the Jesuit missionary work with the Indians.

At statehood Maine's Catholic population consisted of some 750 Indians on two reservations, approximately 2,000 Acadians in the Madawaska District along the St. John River in northern Maine, and about 108 Irish Catholic families living in the area of Damariscotta-Whitefield in Lincoln County.³⁴

A major colonizing effort took place in the town of Benedicta, Aroostook County, in the mid-1830's. Bishop Benedict Fenwick

³²Maine Almanac, pp. 59-165.

³³William Leo Lucey, S. J. The Catholic Church in Maine (Framington: Marshall Jones Company, 1957), p. 1.

³⁴Ernst Christian Helmreich, Religion and the Maine Schools: An Historical Approach (Brunswick: Bureau for Research in Municipal Government, 1960), p. 10. Also Lucey, pp. 29-39. The Irish-Catholic settlement in Damariscotta was started by two Irish merchants from Boston in early 1790's, James Kavanagh and Matthew Cottrill, who became leading citizens and were responsible for the first Catholic church to be built in Maine. The church was St. Patricks in Damariscotta, now the oldest Catholic church in New England.

of Boston promoted a scheme to create an agricultural colony for the Irish living in the slums of Boston. Although less than a third of the families who subscribed to the plan actually settled in Benedicta, the planting of potatoes did develop as a major agricultural pursuit in the country.³⁵

The migration of Irish-Catholics into Maine continued for the next decade, so that by 1870 there were substantial Irish settlements in Bangor, Lewiston, and Portland. The major Irish-Catholic counties were Androscoggin, Cumberland, Penobscot, Washington, and York.³⁶

A second source of Catholics in Maine were the French-Canadian immigrants that settled in the mill towns following the Civil War. Rapid growth in Catholic ranks occurred in the 1870's with the Irish in Bangor and Portland and the French-Canadians in Lewiston and Biddeford. Of the nearly 100,000 Catholics in Maine in the 1890's, nearly 53,000 were French-Canadian.³⁷ After 1905 additional Catholic immigration came from Eastern Europe, particularly from Italy, Poland, and Russia.³⁸ By the mid-1930's newer Catholic ethnic centers were

³⁵Lucey, pp. 81-87. Also New Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. IX (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), p. 82.

³⁶James Paul Allen. "Catholics in Maine: A Social Geography" (Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1970), pp. 180-182.

³⁷Lucey, pp. 227-228.

³⁸Ibid., p. 277.

established with Italians in Portland and Millinocket together with the Lebanese in Waterville.³⁹

The portion of the state's population that is Catholic has remained remarkably constant since the 1930's, ranging from about 22 per cent in 1930 to 25.7 per cent in 1977.⁴⁰ The years of 1958 and 1966 had larger percentages of the population as Catholic, 26.7 per cent and 27.9 per cent respectively.⁴¹ In absolute numbers, there were 264,538 Maine Catholics in a total population of 1,028,000 in 1977.⁴²

Comparable data for the individual counties is not generally available. The U.S. Census figures for 1926 and 1936 used later in this work are based on the per cent of church membership that is Catholic rather than per cent of the population that is Catholic. James P. Allen, in his work, Catholics in Maine: A Social Geography, interpolates the census data and that of the National Council of Churches of Christ. The 1936 census figure for Maine showed 61.2 per cent of the church membership to be Catholic, while the comparable figure in 1952 was 60.8 per cent.⁴³

³⁹Allen, p. 201.

⁴⁰New Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. IX, p. 81. Also The Official Catholic Directory (New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1958, 1966, 1977), p. 579, 672, 698.

⁴¹The Official Catholic Directory, 1958, 1966, p. 579, 672.

⁴²The Official Catholic Directory, 1977, p. 698.

⁴³New Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. IX, p. 82.

The 1936 census data had nine counties with church membership of 50 per cent or more of the Catholic faith, led by Aroostook, Androscoggin, and York with over 70 per cent.⁴⁴ By 1952, the Catholic populations of Androscoggin, Cumberland, and York Counties had grown the most rapidly.⁴⁵ Only Androscoggin County had a Catholic population of more than 50 per cent of the church population. Penobscot, Oxford, and Somerset Counties had shown decreases in Catholic church membership since 1936.⁴⁶

Allen's data indicated that, in 1968, the Catholic population for Maine's largest cities were 76 per cent for Lewiston, 30 per cent for Portland, and 18 per cent for Bangor. He found the contrast between Lewiston and the other two cities to be explained by the presence of the Franco-Americans in Lewiston.⁴⁷

In Maine, as is the case nationwide, the Catholic vote is an important part of support for the Democratic Party. This has been

⁴⁴U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Religious Bodies: 1936, Vol. 1, p. 622. Kennebec, Oxford, and Somerset had from 60 to 70 per cent Catholic church membership; while Penobscot, Franklin, and Cumberland Counties had from 50 to 60 per cent of their church membership identified as Catholic.

⁴⁵Allen, p. 263.

⁴⁶Allen, p. 264. The corresponding figures for the seven other leading counties were: Aroostook 40 per cent, York 37 per cent, Kennebec 25 per cent, Cumberland 23 per cent, Penobscot 18 per cent, Oxford 17 per cent, and Somerset 16 per cent. These are all approximate figures taken from graphs.

⁴⁷Allen, pp. 269-270.

particularly true since the mid-1920's in this state.⁴⁸

Political Institutional Factors

It is easy to identify but difficult to measure the effects of the electoral structures that have become important in determining the outcome of elections and hence the fortunes of political parties. Each state tends to be unique in those structures it sets up by law and custom, although in recent years there has been a greater homogenization of election laws brought about directly or indirectly through the influence of the federal government.

Early in Maine's history as a state, three electoral devices stand out. Annual elections for the legislature and governor, with the requirement that the legislature choose the governor if he failed to garner a majority of the vote. The impact here was probably to increase the importance and power of party factions and encourage the growth of third parties because of the possibilities of influencing the outcome. Not until 1880 would the legislature and governor be given two-year terms and the governor selected by a plurality of the vote. In 1883, annual sessions of the legislature were discontinued. They would be re-established in 1975.

⁴⁸Allen, p. 286. Allen identified elements of a Catholic vote in the 1924 Maine primary and general election as well as the 1928 presidential election.

The third early important institutional factor that continued until the 1950's was Maine's practice of holding its election in September for all but the President. It brought about the slogan, "as Maine goes, so goes the nation," a reasonable barometer through the 1850's, but much less accurate during Republican control of the state. More importantly, it may have contributed somewhat to the isolation of state politics, although both national parties tended to become involved in the state elections, particularly those for governor in the 20th century.

In 1957 two constitutional changes brought a four-year term for the governor and an election date identical with those of other states for state and federal officers. The governor's election was scheduled in the even-numbered non-presidential election years.

The second decade of the 1900's saw two additional changes. The first, the Direct Primary Law of 1911, controversial in its own right, provided for all national, state, and county nominees to be selected by primary election. Provision was made, however, for independent candidacies through petition. The primary has been given credit for reducing, if not defeating, the influence of the "Ring," that self-professed leadership of the Republican Party so disliked by the "liberal" wing of the party.

A second important change came in the direct election of United States Senators, ratified in Maine in 1913, but first occurring in the election of 1916. This may have further diluted the influence of the state legislature in politics, although it continued to select

certain constitutional executive officers and the executive council.

The most recent change that has directly affected the electoral process has been the change of ballot form from the party column ballot to the office bloc. This is said to make it easier for voters to "split their ticket" and reduce straight party voting. Maine has been noted for its ticket-splitting, and normally the minority party selects instruction of the voter in ticket-splitting as an electoral device.

Over the years Maine politics have followed a number of "customs" which have influenced the election results. Early in its history, the custom of the Federalist Party of not contesting the Democratic-Republican control of state and national elective positions contributed to the inequities in party victories.

More recently, the "unspoken rule" of defeated candidates in primary elections not running as independents in the general election, although recently tested, provided some measure of control by party leadership. The belief that United States Senators should be selected from different parts of the state had the effect of eliminating some potential candidates or bringing about changes in residences.

The regionalism of east and west, still present in Maine politics, influenced the selection of candidates and created a degree of factionalism. In some cases the feeling of region has spawned third party candidacies.

The list of electoral factors is certainly not exhaustive, but, from the historical perspective, are apparent in their influence

in Maine elections from time to time. More specifically, the institutional factors created the framework within which parties and their adherents had to work. They became a part of the predictive political process.

C H A P T E R I I

A BRIEF HISTORY

The Beginning

Maine has had a recorded history of over 970 years, beginning with the visit of Lief Erickson in 1003, continuing through the explorations of the Cabots of the 1490's, and the years of savage Indian warfare starting in the 1670's. The state's active role in America's wars began with the Revolution, although its fight for statehood did not successfully culminate until 1820. Maine's early flirtation with prohibition and anti-slavery stance resulted in its years of Republican predominance ending only in Democratic victories of the 1950's and 1960's. Now Maine has the fight to return land to the Indian tribes and an experiment with an Independent governor.

In many respects Maine has been different from the other states of the United States and yet, at the same time, has exhibited characteristics of national trends and has followed a strong element of regionalism. This has been particularly true of its politics.

From earlier explorations and settlement by the French on Mount Desert Island in 1604 and the establishment of the Popham Colony

in 1607 (first English settlement), Maine got its beginnings. In 1622, the Council for New England granted to Sir Ferdinando Gorges and Captain John Mason the land between the Merrimac and Kennebec Rivers, which was to become the "Province of Maine." Permanent settlements of Monhegan (1622), Saco (1623), and York (1624) sprang up because of easy accessibility to shipping.¹

The death of the original grantees, the difficulties in settlement due to the Indian wars, and the gradual control of the settlements by the Massachusetts Puritans from 1650's on led to the Massachusetts claim to the area in 1677.²

In 1691, a new Massachusetts charter granted by William and Mary settled title to the land with the colony of Massachusetts and the political entity known as "Maine" ceased to exist.³ In 1778 the area was designated as the "District of Maine of Massachusetts," a designation continued until statehood was achieved in 1820.⁴

Maine's political importance as a part of Massachusetts grew only as its increase in population gave it importance. From a population of about 10,000 in 1750, to approximately 50,000 during the Revolutionary War, Maine's population grew to a total of 298,335. At statehood Maine was the fastest growing segment of Massachusetts from the 1780's

¹Maine: A Guide Downeast, p. 34.

²Ibid., p. 35.

³Ronald F. Banks, Maine Becomes a State: The Movement to Separate Maine From Massachusetts, 1785-1820 (Middleton: Wesleyan University Press, 1970), p. 4.

⁴Ibid.

on. Probably only a third of this was natural increase, with the bulk of the settlers coming from New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and other New England states to the south.⁵

The availability of land, which was the cause of the settlement boom, also provided the major political issue in a volatile political scene in Maine during the post Revolutionary War era. In particular, it gave impetus to the rise of the Democratic - Republican Party of Jefferson and provided much of the fuel for the continuing Republican victories dating from 1805 on.⁶

Politics in the District of Maine was characterized by factionalism prior to the success of the Democratic Republicans, although the Federalists dominated as they had in Massachusetts. Ambitious individuals developed patterns of local support that failed to penetrate outside their own counties.⁷ The Federalists maintained control through well-placed individuals holding offices or judges, justices, probate officers, county treasurers, and sheriffs. These individuals together with older established families and professional allies, particularly lawyers, provided the leadership of the Federalist Party.⁸

The flood of settlers into Maine because of the availability

⁵Ibid., p. 6.

⁶Banks, p. 6. Louis C. Hatch, Maine, A History (Somersworth: New Hampshire Publishing Company, 1974), p. 70. Paul Goodman, The Democratic Republicans of Massachusetts: Politics in a Young Republic (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), p. 125.

⁷Goodman, p. 51.

⁸Goodman, p. 75, Banks, p. 49.

of land, about 17,000,000 acres in 1783,⁹ brought a challenge to Federalist rule and provided the issues of political conflict. The original grants of land plus those granted to Revolutionary War heroes such as Henry Knox and the purchase of over two million acres by William Bingham of Philadelphia for speculative purposes provided the major point of controversy. Families refused to pay for lands they settled on because they questioned the validity of the proprietors to title of the land or they had no money. Many of the grants required settlement of farmers to retain title.

The Bingham grant required the settlement of 2,500 farmers by 1803,¹⁰ but the owners failed in this and were saved by their agent, David Cobb, the epitomy of the Maine Federalist through his influence in the legislature.¹¹ Democratic-Republicans exploited the connection between the Federalists and the land proprietors and gained the votes needed to help assure their party's success.

William King, who in 1803 had changed from the Federalist Party to the Democratic-Republicans as had many of the early Republican leaders in the state, became spokesman for the settlers.¹² Increased conflict between the squatters and land agents as a result of increased suits of ejection after 1807 led to armed resistance and, in one case,

⁹Banks, p. 6.

¹⁰Goodman, p. 156.

¹¹Ibid. Cobb, as President of the Maine Senate, used his influence in the legislature to prevent forfeiture of the Bingham lands.

¹²Banks, p. 48; Goodman, p. 156.

death for two agents in the "Malta War" of 1809.¹³ King and several of his associates agreed to take over the obligation of settlement, for which they received three towns along the Kennebec.¹⁴

Still no orderly process existed either for settlement of the towns or for paying for improvements. A start was made in 1808 when William King helped shepard the Betterment Act through the Massachusetts Legislature. Provisions of the Act barred the ejection of settlers from land without payment for the value of improvements made to the land as assessed by a local jury. In addition, local juries could also determine a fair price for land without improvements.¹⁵ In return for this "true friendship" toward the settlers, the Democratic-Republican leaderships were rewarded with support at the ballot box. It is estimated that the "squatters" made up 60 per cent of the Democratic-Republican vote.¹⁶

There was also a religious element to the rise of the Democratic-Republican Party in Maine. The Baptists and Methodists, in an effort to compete with the entrenched Congregationalist church which had allied itself with the Federalists, supported the Democratic-Republicans. Partly the support came as a result of the more "liberal" Republican philosophy and partly the support came as the only avenue to challenge the bulwarks of religious orthodoxy. By statehood in 1820

¹³Banks, p. 48.

¹⁴Goodman, p. 156.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 157-158.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 127.

the Baptists were the largest denomination in Maine, numbering some 9,300, and the Methodists could claim over 6,000 adherents.¹⁷

The intensity of feeling between the Congregationalists and other religions can be seen in the later attempts of the Republican leadership, and particularly William King, to gain control of that early bastion of Congregationalism, Bowdoin College. Viewed by the Republicans and the Baptists as a "closed corporation," a center of religious orthodoxy, and a center of diehard Federalist elitist ideas, efforts were made to control the college through its charter and later by Article VIII of the newly-drafted Maine Constitution in 1819.¹⁸ Earlier William King had supported the Baptists as champion of their newly chartered Maine Literary and Theological Institute, later Colby College, as part of a country-wide effort to establish a Baptist seminary in every state.¹⁹

The third element of support of the Democratic-Republicans, from which the leadership was drawn, was the rising class of merchants located along the coast and up through the Kennebec River Valley.

Henry Dearborn of Monmouth was the national party contact.

¹⁷Banks, p. 140.

¹⁸Banks, pp. 167-179. Bowdoin College was named for a governor of Massachusetts and a number of its early presidents were Congregational ministers, several of whom were Harvard graduates. Its "elitist" nature can be seen by the graduating class of 1825, which included William Pitt Fessenden, Franklin Pierce, John S. C. Abbott, George Cheever, Henry W. Longfellow, and Nathaniel Hawthorne. Hatch, pp. 764-766.

¹⁹Banks, p. 139.

Dearborn had come to Maine from New Hampshire in 1784, but he already had contacts with national political leaders. He had served in the Revolutionary War on Washington's staff and had accompanied Benedict Arnold on the march to Quebec. President Washington appointed Dearborn the U. S. Marshall for the District of Maine in 1789. President Jefferson appointed him Secretary of War in 1801, after he had served as a member of Congress.²⁰

Allied with Henry Dearborn in the Republican stronghold of Kennebec County was his protege, John Chandler. Chandler came to Maine from New Hampshire after the Revolutionary War with several other families, including two of Dearborn's brothers, in 1783. Penniless and illiterate, Chandler borrowed money to buy land, went to school with the children and, in general, began to prosper. Dearborn obtained a postmastership for him in 1794 and Chandler supplied the local leaderships of the Republicans while the chief was in Washington. Chandler later served in the Massachusetts Senate and in Congress. He resigned from Congress in 1808 to become Sheriff of Kennebec County during the crisis over land.²¹

Dearborn and Chandler were assisted by others in Kennebec and Penobscot Counties, including Nathan Weston of Augusta, Barzellai Gannett, Francis Carr, Martin Kinsley, and Eleazar Ripley.²²

²⁰Ibid., p. 46.

²¹Banks, p. 47; Hatch, p. 114.

²²Goodman, p. 121.

A second center of Republican influence was Saco, in York County, led by Thomas Cutts, who had inherited his father's merchant business and land holdings. Cutts had successfully challenged the rule of Federalist George Thatcher, who had been repeatedly sent to Congress by overwhelming margins. By the early 1800's the Republicans had assumed political control of the county by sending Richard Cutts to Congress.²³ Richard Cutts then married Dolly Madison's sister in 1804 and became one of the chief contacts with the national Democratic-Republicans along with Henry Dearborn.²⁴ The Cutts family's money and wealth was used to establish the Portland, Maine, Eastern Argus in 1803, the first Democratic-Republican newspaper in the state.²⁵

After Cutts left Congress the mantle of Republican leadership passed to John Holmes of Alfred and William Pitt Preble of Saco.²⁶ Holmes, originally a Federalist, became a Democratic-Republican in 1811 because he was unable to obtain public office. He was called the "Duke of Summersets" because of his change.²⁷ Holmes served in the Massachusetts General Court, was elected to Congress in 1816 and 1818, and was appointed one of Maine's first senators when statehood was achieved.²⁸ William Pitt Preble's role was more as a manager rather

²³Ibid., pp. 121-122.

²⁴Banks, pp. 45-46.

²⁵Ibid., p. 46.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Hatch, p. 117.

²⁸Ibid.

than as a leader, for because of his erasable personality, he did not run for elective office.²⁹

The leader of the Republicans with the greatest and most lasting influence was William King of Bath. A half-brother of Rufus King, noted Federalist and diplomat from New York, King was born in Scarborough and had only limited education. King moved to Topsham as a partner in the saw mill business, and he opened a store with his brother-in-law, Dr. Benjamin J. Porter. King moved to Bath in 1800 and got involved in shipping, real estate, banking, and warehouses. He later was part owner of the first cotton mill in Maine at Brunswick and the toll bridge across the river at Topsham.³⁰ William King's political career began as a representative of Topsham in the Massachusetts General Court in 1795. King became a Republican in 1803. He served as representative to the Massachusetts Legislature from Bath in 1800-1803 and was elected Senator to represent the Lincoln District in 1807 and 1808.³¹ William King was instrumental in the separation movement from Massachusetts, and he later became Maine's first governor.

The earlier Maine historians called the leadership groups of Cutts, Holmes, Chandler, Preble, King, and later Albion Keith Parris of Oxford the ruling junta, indicating a combination of factions rather than an organized political body.

²⁹Ibid., p. 123.

³⁰Hatch, p. 119; Banks, pp. 48-49; Goodman, p. 123.

³¹Hatch, p. 119.

Professor Goodman, in his Democratic-Republicans of Massachusetts indicates that the "cement" that held the leaders and followers together was a common desire to oust Federalists from their establishment positions in the social and economic realms as well as the political.³² Others feel that motivations of the Democratic-Republicans concerned basic human values and compassion for the downtrodden as well.³³

Whatever the reasons for the success, by 1805, the District of Maine was solidly Democratic-Republican and it would continue to be until 1830. The Democratic-Republicans would capture an average of 56.6 per cent of the vote in the years 1805 to 1820 and three times during the period would help elect Republican governors as Maine's percentage of the Massachusetts gubernatorial vote grew to 25 per cent by 1807.³⁴

The Republican success was accompanied by major increases in voter turnout in a region that was notorious for poor turnout. There were steady and substantial increases beginning in 1804 (6,585) to a highwater mark of 17,841 in 1812.³⁵ There were general reductions in turnout from 1813 to 1820 for both parties. Low Republican percentages in the gubernatorial elections of 1809, 1813, and 1814 reflect Republican disenchantment with the Embargo Act and the effect of the war on

³²Goodman, p. 125.

³³Banks, p. 50.

³⁴Goodman, p. 132.

³⁵Banks, p. 45. The author discovered some discrepancies in the totals in the table.

New England shipping. The War of 1812 and the events leading up to it cut across party lines and found the coastal areas generally opposed regardless of party affiliation.

At least from 1816 on, the issue of separation became a party issue in Maine with the Federalists opposing statehood in part because it would place them in a permanent minority status.³⁶ It was only after William King made a pledge that the Federalists would gain a proportionate share of political offices in Maine, believed to be one-third, that the Federalists supported separation from Massachusetts.³⁷ This enabled the Federalist Party to maintain its identity in Maine until 1828, rather than being "amalgamated" into the Republican Party.³⁸

The Republican Party maintained its supremacy during the first decade of statehood. William King was elected the first governor, John Holmes and John Chandler chosen to be Maine's first Senators. All in all, the Democratic-Republicans controlled the major political offices 85 per cent of the time (Table 9).

Apparently the Federalists did not challenge for the offices of governor or Senator during the decade.

Certain institutional factors in the Maine government which had been patterned after Massachusetts had bearing on election outcomes.³⁹

³⁶ Ibid., p. 78.

³⁷ Hatch, p. 143; Banks, p. 135.

³⁸ Richard P. McCormick, The Second American Party System: Party Formation in the Jacksonian Era (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1966), p. 51.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 50.

TABLE 9

Democratic-Republican Victories
in Governor, Senate and House
Races 1820-1830

<u>Party</u>	<u>Governor</u>	<u>Senator</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Total</u>
Dem-Republicans	10 (100%)	5 (100%)	30 (79%)	45 (85%)
Federalists	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (21%)	8 (15%)

Source: Annual Register of Maine, pp. 140-145, 180-183. Table includes vacancies filled because of resignations and deaths.

There were annual September elections for the governor and members of the legislature, with senators elected from districts and representatives from towns. There was adult male suffrage and voting by ballot with an absolute majority vote needed to elect the governor. If gubernatorial candidates failed to achieve a majority of the vote, the selection was made by the legislature. This factor made the control of the legislature doubly important and may have brought about stronger party organizations.

Maine followed the legislative caucus type of candidate selection for the top offices and utilized the central committee as a means to control local party committees. The apparatus has been cited as being

centralized and well-disciplined.⁴⁰

Yet, in operations, the Maine political scene seemed more akin to factionalism. Governor King resigned in his first full year to accept appointment as a commissioner for settling the claims of American ship owners against Spain. There was some indication that he wanted to work in behalf of William H. Crawford for the presidency.⁴¹ Three leading Democratic-Republicans vied for the party nomination for governor the next year.

In the presidential politics of 1824, the ruling junta, with William King in the forefront, called for the rank and file to disregard the legislative caucus which had supported Adams, and follow the congressional caucus, which had voted for Crawford.⁴² Maine cast its electoral votes for John Quincy Adams, but the seeds of disunity had been sown.

The Argus and the junta came out against Adams's re-election in March of 1827. General disenchantment with the Adams's presidency arose over Maine's exclusion from the West Indies Trade and the national tariff policy. In the 1828 election, President Adams carried the state by nearly 7,000 votes and Adams's supporters controlled the legislature. They made their presence felt by selecting an all National Republican Executive Council. Jacksonians were removed from the positions of Treasurer, Secretary of State, and numerous county offices.⁴³

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 24.

⁴¹Hatch, p. 176.

⁴²Hatch, p. 184; McCormick, p. 51.

⁴³Hatch, p. 195-196.

McCormick views the election of 1828 as critical in the re-alignment of Maine political parties to coincide with the Whig-Democrat dichotomy of the succeeding decades.⁴⁴ In the gubernatorial election of the following year, the Adams's followers through their legislative caucus selected Jonathan Hutton. The Democrats of Jackson held the first state convention ever in Maine and chose Samuel E. Smith. In the election Hutton won an apparent small majority, but the House was about equally divided and in the Senate there were four vacancies. The organization of the legislature took nearly a month, with the Democrats controlling the House, the National Republicans controlling the Senate, but Hutton became governor.⁴⁵

The following year Smith won 52 per cent of the vote in an election that saw a turnout of 67 per cent of the voters.⁴⁶ The Democrats had established their control in Maine.

Control by the Democrats - 1830-1854

The first period of Democratic control in the state began with the election of Samuel Smith as governor in 1830 and continued until 1854. It was as nearly total as had been the previous Democratic-Republican

⁴⁴McCormick, p. 54.

⁴⁵Hatch, pp. 197-203.

⁴⁶McCormick, p. 53. McCormick incorrectly lists Smith as the winner of the 1829 gubernatorial election.

hold on the state as Table 10 indicates.

TABLE 10

Democratic Victories in Governor, Senate,
and House Races 1830-1854

<u>Party</u>	<u>Governor</u>	<u>Senator</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Total</u>
Democrats	21 (91%)	10 (91%)	67 (73%)	98 (78%)
Whigs	2 (9%)	1 (9%)	25 (27%)	28 (22%)

Source: Annual Register of Maine, 1972-73, pp. 140-145, 180-183. Table includes vacancies filled because of resignations and deaths. Numbers outside parentheses indicate the number of electoral contests won.

The Democratic Party's grasp on Maine politics appears greater as the figures are examined more closely. The two Whig victories in the governor's races are by Edward Kent of Bangor, the first successful candidate from the eastern section of the state, by the narrow margin of 456 votes in 1839 and by the extremely thin margin of 67⁴⁷ votes in 1840, necessitating selection by the legislature. George Evans of

⁴⁷The Annual Register of Maine indicates the margin of victory in 1840 was 10 votes; Hatch, p. 240, notes a 17 vote margin.

Hallowell, a close friend of Daniel Webster, was elected for seven of the Whig victories in the House of Representatives and received appointment as the only Whig Senator to serve in this period.

The gubernatorial Whig victories, themselves, were accomplished with the assistance of Democratic Party splits. The split began in 1833 when Robert Dunlap of Brunswick received the Democratic gubernatorial nomination over the incumbent Governor Samuel Smith. Dunlap was a "radical" Democrat and not accepted by the old guard. The rift thus created would continue to widen over the next two decades, at first based on an east-west geographical split, but later intensified by disputes over patronage from national sources. Later in the '40's and early '50's, the issues of slavery, temperance and nativism would cause the party to crumble.⁴⁸ The Whig candidate, Edward Kent, won in 1837 when the old guard Democrats refused to support Gorham L. Parks of Bangor.⁴⁹ Kent won the governorship again in 1840 with a vigorous campaign and the help of an over-confident Democratic Party. In 1840 the Whig candidate for President, William Henry Harrison, was the only one to break the string of Democratic victories in Maine which began with Jackson's victory in 1832 and lasted through the Republican Party's victory with John C. Fremont in 1856.

⁴⁸Richard R. Wescott, "A History of Maine Politics, 1840-1850, The Formation of the Republican Party" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Maine, 1966), pp. 5-25. The writer is particularly indebted to Dr. Wescott for his manuscript and its thorough coverage of Maine politics for the period indicated.

⁴⁹The first instance of the increasing influence of Eastern Maine in politics -- both men were from Bangor.

Kennebec and Somerset Counties were the major Whig strongholds, with Whig support to be found in both Lincoln and Washington Counties. The Whigs, themselves, although a minority party, would find themselves splitting; at first over President Tyler's patronage policies, and later over the issues of annexation of Texas, extension of slavery, abolition, and prohibition.⁵⁰

During this particularly volatile political time, Maine reflected much of the national turmoil. In spite of elections that were held at the state level on the second Monday of September,⁵¹ and an election system which gave particular meaning and importance to factionalism, Maine tended to follow national trends.⁵² This was the case in major party politics as well as third-party movements.

The Anti-Masonic Party ran a candidate, Thomas A. Hill, for governor in 1833 and 1834, gaining 5 per cent of the vote in 1833. The Liberty Party was brought to Maine briefly by anti-slavery Whigs in Somerset County, in 1840, with their nomination of electors for James G. Birney. The party was formally established in Winthrop, in 1841, nominating Jeremiah Curtis for governor and James Birney for president.⁵³ By 1842 the Liberty Party was running a full slate of officers in every county.⁵⁴ The Liberty Party would disappear in 1848,

⁵⁰Wescott, pp. 26-27.

⁵¹Change effected in 1960.

⁵²Wescott, p. 17.

⁵³Ibid., pp. 40, 47.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 43.

but would average over 6,000 votes in gubernatorial elections, culminating in Samuel Fessenden's 12,027 vote total for governor in 1848. In 1846, Maine Liberty Party candidates would be elected to the legislature.⁵⁵ Unlike most other states, the Liberty Party strength corresponded to Democratic losses rather than Whig losses.⁵⁶

The Liberty Party's successor, the Free Soil Party, became an entity in May of 1848 in Buffalo, New York.⁵⁷ In July, 1848, a Free Soil Convention was called in Portland and, although most of the leaders were the old Liberty Party men, the Whigs, the Democrats as well as the Liberty Party were represented. The Free Soil district and county conventions were held in August of 1848.⁵⁸ Martin Van Buren, the Free Soilers' presidential candidate, carried 13.85 per cent of the vote; and the Free Soilers controlled the balance of the vote in Cumberland, Franklin, Penobscot, and Piscataquis Counties.⁵⁹

The final element of the political party realignment of the 1850's in Maine was the temperance movement. The Maine Temperance Society was formed in 1834 and after an inner battle in which the

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 81.

⁵⁶James L. Sundquist, Dynamics of the Party System: Alignment and Realignment of Political Parties in the United States (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1973), p. 47. Sundquist found that correlations of Liberty Party strength with Whig and Democratic losses between 1840 and 1844 for Maine were 0.493 for Whig losses and 0.711 for Democratic losses.

⁵⁷Sundquist, pp. 52-53.

⁵⁸Wescott, pp. 100-102.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 116.

"moderates" lost emerged as a new organization led by Neal Dow. The new Maine Temperance Union concentrated its efforts at the local level.⁶⁰ By 1851, with its leader, Neal Dow, the mayor of Maine's largest city, Portland, a successful prohibition campaign resulted in the Maine Law being passed by the legislature.

The 1852 elections brought the realignment of Maine's political parties. The Democratic Party split, offering two candidates. Dr. John Hubbard, supported by the new party leader, Hannibal Hamlin, was the candidate of the pro-temperance, anti-1850 compromise, anti-slavery faction. Anson G. Chandler of the "Wildcat" faction was the anti-Maine Law, pro-compromise candidate. Hubbard was the winner of the nomination and later the election, but in the next year, 1853, the "Woolheads" bolted the party, nominated Anson P. Morrill as candidate. Morrill came in third, but a coalition of Whigs, Morrill Democrats and Free Soilers combined to control the legislature and select the Whig candidate, Crosby, governor, although the regular Democratic candidate, Pillsbury, had a plurality of the vote.⁶¹ The elements of the coalition would form the nascent Republican Party in the state.

In 1854 the Know-Nothing movement came to Maine, but rather than becoming an independent political force, both parties, Whigs and Democrats alike, worked to enroll members to exert control over the movement.⁶² Anti-Catholic, or perhaps anti-Irish, feeling reached a

⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 37-40.

⁶¹Ibid., pp. 185-201.

⁶²Ibid., p. 248.

peak in Maine with the burning of a Catholic church in Bath and the tarring and feathering of a Catholic priest, John Bapst, by a mob in Ellsworth. Prohibition also played a role in the "nativist" emotions as exemplified by the Know-Nothing "American" Party.

Anson P. Morrill, the Know-Nothing and Maine Law candidate for governor who, in 1855, would become the first Republican governor, won the election in 1854, increasing his previous vote total from 11,027 to 44,565. Some 4,500 votes came from the Democratic regulars, 13,000 from the Whigs, and 9,000 from the Free Soil Party.⁶³ Morrill had a plurality in every county except Aroostook and a majority in seven counties, including Cumberland, Kennebec, Sagadahoc, Hancock, Penobscot, Waldo, and Franklin.⁶⁴ Five Republican congressmen were chosen, the only Democrat being an incumbent from Calais. Two of the Republican congressmen had previously been elected as Whigs, Israel Washburn, Jr. and Samuel P. Benson.⁶⁵

The Republican Party was officially established in Maine in 1855, and Anson P. Morrill was re-elected governor as its standard bearer. Voter turnout reached 110,477, the first time over 100,000 and nearly 20,000 over the previous year's total.

Republicans elected to the U. S. House of Representatives and the Republican presidential candidate, John C. Fremont, carried every county with margins ranging from 72 per cent of the vote in

⁶³Wescott, pp. 252-253.

⁶⁴Ibid.

⁶⁵Annual Register of Maine, p. 143.

Kennebec to only 51 per cent in Aroostook.

TABLE 11

Support of Republican Candidate For
President 1856

A. Counties Supporting Fremont by more than 65% of vote	Franklin (65)
	Kennebec (72)
	Penobscot (66)
	Sagadahoc (69)
	Somerset (65)
B. Counties Supporting Fremont by 60-65% of vote	Piscataquis (63)
	Waldo (61)
	Androscoggin (64)
	Hancock (61)
C. Counties Supporting Fremont by 55-60% of vote	Cumberland (58)
	Lincoln (55)
	Oxford (58)
	York (56)
D. Counties Supporting Fremont by 50-55% of vote	Aroostook (51)
	Washington (53)

State totals 61% of vote for Fremont.

Source: Presidential Ballots, pp. 500-504.

Maine as a whole saw an increase of voters of some 27,000 over the previous presidential election, but still some 10,000 short of the turnout for the September gubernatorial election.

The Republican margin would increase only slightly statewide with the candidacy of Abraham Lincoln in 1860, with a smaller turnout, in spite of Hannibal Hamlin's presence on the ticket as a vice-presidential running mate. Although William H. Seward of New York was the choice of most state Republicans, both Hannibal Hamlin and James G. Blaine opposed Seward's nomination and, belatedly, became supporters of Lincoln at the convention in Chicago.⁶⁶ The victorious Lincoln improved on Fremont's 1856 performance only in Aroostook and Lincoln Counties. The period of Republican control in Maine state politics had begun.

The Republican Ascendancy
1856 - 1954

For the remainder of the 19th century, Republican control was nearly complete. No Democrat served as U. S. Senator. In the United States House of Representatives only L. D. M. Sweat, a Portland Democrat, running under the Union banner during the Civil War, and two National Greenback Party candidates, George W. Ladd of Bangor and Thompson H. Murch of Rockland in 1878, broke the Republican dominance. Alonzo Garcelon, a Lewiston Democrat, in 1879, and Harry Plaisted of Bangor, a Fusion candidate in 1881, interrupted the Republican monopoly in the governor's chair.

⁶⁶ Hatch, pp. 420-422. Ironically Hannibal Hamlin was actively supported for the vice presidential nomination by Seward's followers in New York.

The accompanying table (Table 12) indicates the completeness of Republican control during the next century.

TABLE 12

Republican Victories in Governor,
Senate and House Contests
1856 - 1954

<u>Party</u>	<u>Governor</u> (61)	<u>Senator</u> (48)	<u>House</u> (215)
Republican	92% (56)	96% (46)	94% (202)
Democratic	7% (4)	4% (2)	4% (9)
Other	1% (1) Fusion		1% (4) Greenback

Source: Annual Register of Maine, 1972-73. Figures in parenthesis indicate the number of election contests won.

This was the period of the "giants" of Maine politics. Not only did a few dominate the state political scene, but through political skill, incumbency, and seniority occupied positions of authority in the national government.

From the Civil War until well into the 20th century, the Senate seats from Maine were held, for the most part, by four men: Hannibal Hamlin, Lot M. Morrill, William P. Frye, and Eugene Hale.

James G. Blaine served one term before his appointment as Secretary of State by President Garfield. Blaine lost the presidency by a very narrow margin in 1884 and failed in a second attempt to gain the nomination in 1892. He served as Benjamin Harrison's Secretary of State. Earlier, during his tenure in the U. S. House of Representatives, Blaine had served for six years as Speaker. Hannibal Hamlin, in addition to serving as Vice President, was appointed as Minister to Spain in 1882. Lot Morrill served as Secretary of the Treasury under President Grant. Senator Frye, in a distinguished career in the U. S. Senate, served as chairman of the Commerce Committee and as President Pro-Tem of the Senate for fifteen years. He was appointed a commissioner to negotiate the treaty with Spain following the Spanish-American War. He would twice be considered as a candidate for Vice President. Senator Hale was chairman of the Naval Committee.

Republicans with ten or more years of service in the House of Representatives in the latter half of the 18th century were James G. Blaine, Eugene Hale, William P. Frye, Thomas B. Reed, Nelson Dingley, Jr., Charles Boutelle, and Seth Milliken. Representative Reed served twice as Speaker of the House, earning the nickname "Czar," and he was the leading candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1896, losing to William McKinley because of an inept campaign.⁶⁷ Nelson Dingley, Jr. was chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means and a high protective tariff of 1897 bears his name. A Maine Democrat, Arthur Sewall, was the vice presidential candidate on the

⁶⁷Hatch, pp. 650-657.

ticket with William Jennings Bryan in 1896.

As a rule, successful Republican gubernatorial candidates served four years, either in successive one-year terms if they so desired, or in two two-year terms after 1880 when the change was made lengthening the governor's term to two years. The exceptions were in 1863 and 1886 when the party leadership made political decisions to change from previously successful candidates. In the first case, the shift was to a "converted Democrat," Samuel Cony,⁶⁸ and in the second case, Edwin Burleigh was selected in place of Sebastian S. Marble who, as President of the Senate of Maine, had succeeded Governor Joseph Bodwell upon his death in 1887.⁶⁹ In both cases the Republican leadership had prevailed.

The latter half of the 19th century was to be the "glory" years of the Republican Party of Maine in terms of its personalities and national influence.

The sole break in Republican control of this period occurred in the years of 1878-1881 because of the Greenback movement. The Greenback Party was a product of the midwest, spawned by the 1873 depression. It developed as a part of the Granger movement and its political arm of Independent Parties.⁷⁰ Efforts to organize nationally began in 1874, resulting in an 80,000 vote total for its candidate for President,

⁶⁸ Hatch, pp. 453-454.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 637.

⁷⁰ William B. Hesseltine, Third Party Movements in the United States (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1962), pp. 51-52.

Peter Cooper. In 1878, the Greenback Party reached its peak, gaining over a million votes in state elections and electing fourteen to the United States House of Representatives.⁷¹

The mover behind the Greenback Party in Maine was Solon Chase of Turner, a politician who had spent time in both the Republican and Democratic Parties. An eccentric known as "Uncle Solon," he criss-crossed the state with a team of oxen, first organizing the party and then campaigning on behalf of its candidate. The Greenbacker candidate gained 520 votes in the governor's race in 1876, over 5,000 in 1877, and in 1878 after a vigorous campaign prevented the Republican candidate from receiving a majority by polling 41,371 votes for second place. The Republican candidate, Connor, received 56,554 votes and the Democratic candidate, Garcelon, 28,208. Under Maine law, neither candidate had won a majority and the decision was left to the legislature for the first time since 1855.⁷² Democrats and Greenbackers held control of the Maine House of Representatives and dictated that the choice would be between Garcelon, the Democratic candidate, and Joseph L. Smith, the Greenback candidate. The Senate, being controlled by the Republicans, provided the balance of votes for the selection of the governor. The Republicans, after briefly flirting with Smith, threw their

⁷¹Ibid., p. 53.

⁷²Richard A. Hebert, Modern Maine: Its Historic Background, People and Resources, Vol. I (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, Inc., 1951), pp. 240-248. Hatch, pp. 593-629, has a longer, more detailed account, but is essentially the same.

support to the Democrat, Dr. Alonzo W. Garcelon of Lewiston.⁷³

The Greenback candidate, Joseph L. Smith, a lumberman from Old Town, carried his own county, Penobscot, and two others, Somerset and Waldo. He out-polled the Democratic candidate in seven other counties.⁷⁴ Smith drew the bulk of his margin in the small rural communities throughout these counties.

In addition, Greenback candidates unseated two incumbent Republican congressmen. George Ladd, a Bangor merchant, running as a combined Democrat and National Greenback candidate, defeated Llewellyn Powers, a Houlton lawyer. Thompson H. Murch, a Rockland stone cutter, defeated five-time congressman, Eugene Hale, an Ellsworth attorney. Both were elected under the Greenback label in the 1880 election.

In 1879 the Republicans attempted to counter the success of the Greenback Party by selecting as its gubernatorial candidate, Daniel F. Davis, a young thirty-five year old attorney from Corinth in Penobscot County. The Greenback Party and the Democrats, although cooperating in a number of lesser candidates for state office, ran the same candidates for governor as they had the previous year.

The campaign captured national attention, bringing to the state Representative James A. Garfield, Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, Secretary of the Treasury John Sherman, and

⁷³Ibid.

⁷⁴The counties were Androscoggin, Franklin, Kennebec, Knox, Oxford, Piscataquis, and York. Vote totals were taken from the Annual Register of Maine for the appropriate election.

Congressman William McKinley as stump speakers for the Republicans.⁷⁵ Many out-of-state Greenbackers came to Maine to promote the candidacy of Smith.

Once again no candidate gained the majority to be elected governor and the choice was left up to the legislature, setting the stage for what has been variously known as the "Great Disputed Election," the Civil War," of 1880.⁷⁶

Although the Republicans had apparently won control of the legislature in the election, Governor Garcelon and his Executive Council, exercising their constitutional prerogative to examine the vote totals for members of the legislature, overturned, on technicalities, a number of the local results. The results were changed from a Republican majority in both houses to a total Fusion majority of seventeen. The Republicans, under the direction of James G. Blaine, asked the Supreme Court to overturn the governor's decision and the battle was engaged. Before a decision selecting Davis was finally made, Augusta became an "armed camp." While guns and ammunition were being shipped from Bangor, Maine's Civil War hero, Joshua L. Chamberlain, was made the commander of the militia to restore order, and the Republicans seized the House of Representatives. To further complicate matters, the Fusion Secretary of State, a deputy of Governor Garcelon, stole the state seal to prevent any official business from being transacted.

⁷⁵Hatch, pp. 596-599.

⁷⁶Actual results were Davis, 68,967; Smith, 47,643; Garcelon, 21,851; Bion Bradbury, 264; scattering, 81. The voter turnout was 136,806, some 10 per cent over the previous year.

Finally, the Fusionists gave up; they accepted the decision of the Supreme Court that the Republicans controlled the legal legislature and that Davis was legally governor. It was January 30, 1880. Maine had been without a recognized state government for over one hundred forty days.⁷⁷

The election in the fall was again extremely close between the incumbent governor, Davis, and the Democrat-Greenback Fusion candidate, Harry Plaisted, of Bangor, with Plaisted winning by merely 169 votes of a total of 147,829. Additionally two constitutional amendments were approved by the voters; one which gave the governor a term of two years, and the other which allowed plurality elections. With the Republicans agreeing that the amendments applied to the just completed election, the Fusion candidate was declared the winner.

The vote had expanded another 7 per cent to nearly 148,000, and the increase in voters and the combination of the Democrat and Greenback followers provided the winning margin. The Fusion candidate carried seven counties, five of those in which the Greenback candidates had done well in.⁷⁸ In five other counties the Fusionists and Republicans ran nearly even. Davis carried only the counties of Hancock, Kennebec,

⁷⁷ Hatch, pp. 599-615; Hebert, pp. 242-245. Also there are a number of popular newspaper accounts of this exciting episode in Maine history.

⁷⁸ Plaisted carried Aroostook, Cumberland, Knox, Lincoln, Penobscot, Somerset, and Waldo Counties. The previous Greenback candidates had not done as well in Cumberland and Lincoln Counties. It is interesting to note that six of these would bolt from the Republican ranks in the election of Frederick W. Plaisted, son of the 1880 election winner, in the defeat of the Republicans in 1910.

Piscataquis, and Sagadahoc.

In the election of 1882 Frederick Robie, a Gorham Republican, defeated Governor Plaisted by a comfortable margin of 55 per cent of the vote and the Republicans were back in control.

The composite of Republican victories for statewide elections until the Democratic breakthrough of 1910 showed an average of 59 per cent of the vote to the Democratic composite of 37.1 per cent.⁷⁹

The Democratic Party's fortune reached bottom. From 1880 to 1912, in presidential politics, only one county, Knox in 1900, would give its votes to the Democratic candidate. No Democratic candidate for the House of Representatives or the Senate won until 1910. The Maine Legislature remained firmly in Republican hands until the uprising in 1910. The election of 1896, so important in a number of other states in establishing vote patterns, apparently had no major impact in Maine.

The 1910-1914 Interlude

The Republican machine rolled on until the election of 1906, when the normal margin of 24,028 votes in governors' races and between 5,000 and 7,000 votes in congressional races fell drastically. The Republican gubernatorial candidate, the incumbent William T. Cobb,

⁷⁹Paul T. David, Party Strength in the United States, 1872-1970 (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1972), pp. 156-159.

beat his opponent, Cyrus W. Davis, by only 8,065 votes although he had beaten the same opponent by 26,816 votes in 1904. The four Republican congressmen defeated their opponents by margins of from 1,300 to 3,500 votes. Only Llewellyn Powers in the fourth district had anywhere near the normal margin of victory.

The election of 1908 proved to be similar, only with narrower margins. Bert M. Fernald, the Republican, beat Obadiah Gardner by some 7,273 votes. The congressional races were again close, but with two new Republican faces in the second and fourth districts. The presidential race was not unusual, William Howard Taft winning by 31,584 votes over William Jennings Bryan. The September election for governor, however, attracted some 37,000 more votes than did the November election for President, a phenomenon previously noted. The Democratic vote for governor exceeded that for the President by 25,960.

In 1910 the Democratic candidate, Frederick W. Plaisted, son of the Democratic-Fusion winner in 1880, defeated incumbent Republican, Bert Fernald, by 8,660 votes, winning 51.8 per cent of the total vote and 53.1 per cent of the major party vote. In winning, Governor Plaisted carried eleven counties and just narrowly missed carrying two others, Washington and York. Only in Aroostook, Franklin, and Oxford Counties did he trail the Republican candidate by substantial margins.

The Democratic victory was even more complete. Two Democrats won House seats; Daniel J. McGillicuddy of Lewiston won in the congressional race in the second district and Samuel W. Gould of Skowhegan won in the third district. Two Republicans, one an incumbent, were

returned by margins of 620 and 501 votes respectively. The Democrats controlled both houses of the state legislature for the first time since 1856, enabling them to choose two Democratic U. S. Senators, Obadiah Gardner to replace Eugene Hale whose term had expired, and Charles F. Johnson to fill the vacancy caused by the death of William P. Frye. In addition, the Democrats selected the all-important Executive Council.

Several explanations have been advanced to explain the change in Maine politics during the period, but the essence of the situation was that a large number of disgruntled Republican voters crossed over to vote for the Democratic candidate.

The data in Table 13 only partially substantiates the cross-over theory. There was definitely a crossover pattern in the 1906 and 1910 elections. Apparently there was a partial movement back in 1912, but in 1914 with the Progressive Party candidate, Halbert P. Gardner, gaining 18,226 votes, there were losses by both parties.

Another factor was simply the increase in voters. Not since the elections of the 1880's had Maine seen the vote totals climb as high as the 140,000 and above. At the end of the period both parties had improved their standings.

Three reasons are cited for the troubles of the Republican Party in the first decade of the 1900's.⁸⁰ The recent Republican

⁸⁰ Elizabeth Ring, "The Progressive Movement of 1912 and Third Party Movement of 1924 in Maine," The Maine Bulletin, University of Maine Studies, Second Series, No. 26, Orono, Maine, 1933, pp. 20-22. She relies somewhat on Hatch, pp. 655-657. Dr. Robert M. York, the state historian, has a brief account entitled, "The Maine Elections of 1912," in the Maine Political Yearbook, The Maine Republican State Committee, 1962.

TABLE 13

Analysis of Votes For Governor
Maine 1904-1916

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Vote</u>	<u>Republican</u>	<u>Democrat</u>	<u>Other</u>
1904	131,512	76,962	50,146	4,404
1906	133,500 (+1,988)	69,427 (-7,535)	61,363 (+11,217)	2,684 (-1,720)
1908	142,666 (+9,166)	73,541 (+4,114)	66,278 (+4,915)	2,837 (+153)
1910	141,464 (-1,102)	64,644 (-8,897)	73,304 (+7,026)	3,616 (+779)
1912	141,940 (+376)	70,931 (+6,287)	67,702 (-5,602)	3,307 (-309)
1914	141,666 (-274)	58,887 (-12,044)	62,076 (-5,625)	20,703 (+17,396)
1916	151,410 (+9,744)	81,760 (+22,873)	67,930 (+5,854)	1,720 (-18,983)

Source: Maine Almanac and Annual Register of Maine.

governors, particularly Governor Fernald, had been especially extravagant. The Democrats used as a campaign issue in 1910 the fact that state expenditures had increased 100 per cent in the period from 1890 to 1904. Under the administration of Governor Fernald, the state had gone from a surplus of \$586,534.44 in 1909 to a projected deficit

of \$750,100 in 1911.⁸¹ The constitutional issue had been raised concerning the propriety of the executive branch borrowing money to tide the state government over until the legislature could meet.

A second major issue had arisen earlier over the inconsistent enforcement of the prohibition law on Maine statute books since 1851. In fact, a prohibition candidate had run for governor in each election year since 1880 on the specific issue of more strict enforcement of prohibition, and had averaged 2,568 votes. But in 1902 the prohibition candidate, James Perrigo, had garnered 4,429 votes, 4 per cent of the total vote cast, and the Republicans had reacted.

A change in the enforcement procedures, known as the "Sturgis Law," was passed by the Republican legislature in 1905. The law called for the appointment of a commission, with power to appoint deputy commissioners to enforce prohibition.⁸² Governor Fernald enthusiastically supported and executed the new law to the dismay of many. The Democrats urged resubmission of the prohibition amendment to the people for a vote.

The third critical area of Republican discontent was the feeling that the national Republicans had failed to meet the needs of the people and that there was need for the reform. This was the message of the "Progressives" of both parties. The high tariff was debated in Maine newspapers and became a campaign issue. President Taft's policy of

⁸¹Ring, p. 21.

⁸²Hatch, pp. 655-656.

reciprocity with Canada threatened the lumbering industry and brought fear of competition among the Aroostook potato growers.

But more importantly, among eastern Republicans, was the dislike of the control of the party by the so-called "Ring" as exemplified by former governor and now Congressman, Edwin C. Burleigh, who was closely connected with the timberland and railroad interests and the owner of the influential newspaper, The Kennebec Journal. The Rickers of Poland Spring had successfully pushed their candidate, Governor Fernald. Further, there was a fractionalization of the eastern wing of the party between the Hale faction and the anti-Hale forces in Aroostook County.

The other factors, not generally mentioned, contributed to the unpopularity of certain of the Republican candidates in the first years of the 20th century. Labor unrest in the pulp and paper industry and particularly in the lime industry of Knox County, brought dislike to Governor William T. Cobb, whose family had long been associated with the control of the industry.⁸³ The law to prevent the export of hydro-electric power produced in Maine, the so-called Fernald Law, although generally applauded at its inception by most Mainers and leaders of both parties eventually cost Governor Fernald some support, difficult to judge at the time.⁸⁴

⁸³Roger L. Grindle, Quarry and Kiln: The Story of Maine's Lime Industry (Rockland: The Courier-Gazette, Inc., 1971), Ch. XI.

⁸⁴Lincoln Smith, The Power Policy of Maine (Berkley: University of California Press, 1951), Ch. VI. The original concept of the Fernald Law was to save electrical power for Maine's use. Only later did the idea of limited federal control and reduced growth for the industry bring a change in attitude. The changing public and business attitude cost Governor Fernald some of his earlier support.

The totality of the national mood with the addition of state issues provided the means for the Democratic victory in 1910. The victory would be short-lived, however.

In spite of substantial progressive legislation, including the Direct Primary Law, a Corrupt Practices Act, a reduction of the public debt and resolutions indicating favor toward popular election of senators and a federal income tax, the Democrats themselves were in trouble in the next election.⁸⁵

In his campaign, Governor Plaisted had promised to keep Maine "as dry as a covered bridge,"⁸⁶ but he had failed. The Democrats re-submitted the prohibition amendment to the people in 1911, only to find the voters reaffirming their dry convictions. Governor Plaisted admitted that his previous experiences had convinced him that prohibition was unenforceable.⁸⁷ The stage was set for a return to Republican control if the Progressive drive could be halted.

In national politics in 1912, Maine supported Theodore Roosevelt wholeheartedly both at the Republican Convention in Chicago, and, failing nomination, at the Progressive Party Convention in Chicago later in the year. A state Progressive Party was formed and held its convention in late July. The decision was made not to split with the Republicans on the state elections in September, but to concentrate their efforts in the national elections.

⁸⁵ Ring, p. 24.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 25.

The first year of operation of the primary elections was 1912 and interestingly enough opposition for nominations came primarily from the Republicans. William T. Haines easily beat two other opponents for the gubernatorial nomination. Three candidates challenged for the Republican Senate nomination with Edwin C. Burleigh winning.⁸⁸ There were Republican opponents in the congressional elections in the third district and Democratic opponents in the first and fourth districts.

The Republican candidate, William T. Haines, defeated the Democratic incumbent, Frederick W. Plaisted, by 3,229 votes, with some of the Republican defectors returning. The Republican gain of 6,287 equals the loss of the Democrats and the increased turnout and loss in the other category. Control of the legislature went back to the Republicans, through the help of a dozen Progressives led by Carl Milliken, the Senate President.

In the national elections in November, the Republicans won three congressional seats, with the incumbent Democrat, McGillicuddy, winning in the second district. The surprise came in the presidential election. Theodore Roosevelt captured 37.7 per cent of the vote, giving the election to Woodrow Wilson, who polled 39.7 per cent of the vote. President Taft came in a distant third with 20.6 per cent of the vote. Roosevelt carried eight counties, nearly evenly divided between west and east; but they were the more rural, agricultural, inland

⁸⁸ Maine Almanac, pp. 337-348. The senatorial candidates were selected by the voters in the primary, but the final selection between Burleigh and the Democratic candidate, Obadiah Gardner was made by the legislature, with Burleigh winning.

counties. Wilson carried eight counties, mostly on the coast.⁸⁹ President Taft was unable to carry a single county, but 12,481 of his total of 26,545 came from Cumberland, Penobscot, and York Counties. Maine had voted for a Democratic presidential candidate for the first time since Franklin Pierce in 1852. One observer noted that Wilson had won in the cities, coming out with a plurality of 5,000 by winning fifteen of the twenty Maine cities.⁹⁰

The Republicans suggested a merger with the Progressives in the elections of 1914, but the Progressives at their state convention voted a resolution to refuse the Republicans and nominate a complete Progressive ticket for the election.⁹¹ The Progressives nominated Halbert P. Gardner and in the primaries William T. Haines ran unopposed for the Republican nomination. Oakley C. Curtis defeated three other challengers in the Democratic primary.

Oakley Curtis won the governor's election by gaining 44.6 per cent of the vote, to the Republicans 42.3 per cent. The Progressive candidate for governor ran far behind Roosevelt's total in 1912 (13.1 per cent to 37.7), but he was instrumental in Democratic victories in Androscoggin, Franklin, Lincoln, Oxford, Penobscot, and Sagadahoc Counties. In Aroostook, Franklin, Kennebec, Oxford, Piscataquis, and

⁸⁹Roosevelt carried Androscoggin, Aroostook, Franklin, Kennebec, Oxford, Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Somerset. Androscoggin and Kennebec were not primarily agricultural. Wilson carried Cumberland, Hancock, Knox, Lincoln, Sagadahoc, Waldo, Washington, and York.

⁹⁰Ring, p. 31.

⁹¹Ibid., pp. 36-37.

Waldo Counties, Halbert Gardner's candidacy seemed to impact on the Democratic Party or, in some cases, both parties equally. Six of the counties having higher than the state average for the Progressive Party vote of 13.1 per cent had voted for Roosevelt in the 1912 election, the other two had voted for Wilson.

In the Maine Legislature the results were mixed, with the Democrats controlling the House and the Republicans the Senate. Five Progressives had been elected, but the Progressives might have assisted the Republicans in selecting the constitutional offices had they so chosen. They did not and the Democrats were voted in. Little was accomplished with the split legislature in 1915, however.⁹²

Two occurrences brought about the demise of the Progressive Party in Maine prior to the 1916 elections. First, an acceptable candidate to Roosevelt was selected at the Republican National Convention. Roosevelt publically threw his support to Charles Evans Hughes, the compromise candidate. In Maine, the Republican primary voters selected the Progressive, Carl E. Milliken, an Island Falls lumberman. The Progressive candidate, Edwin Lawrence, withdrew and the Progressives and Republicans merged. None of the other Progressive candidates running for the Maine Legislature won.⁹³

The successful candidate, Milliken, won with 54.6 per cent of

⁹²Ibid., pp. 39-40. The Lewiston Evening Journal is quoted as saying that the greatest accomplishment of the 1915 Legislature was the motion for adjournment. Workman's Compensation and a 50 Hour Labor Law for women and children had been enacted.

⁹³Ibid., pp. 43-44.

the vote, with only Androscoggin and Knox Counties supporting the incumbent governor, Oakley Curtis. The gains of the Democratic Party were more apparent than real during the period.

TABLE 14

Comparison of Vote 1906-1916
State and Selected Counties
Per Cent Vote For Democratic
Candidate for Governor

	<u>1906</u>	<u>1908</u>	<u>1910</u>	<u>1914</u>	<u>1916</u>
State	47.0	47.4	53.1	44.6	45.4
Androscoggin	57.3	53.4	59.4	56.7	51.1
Franklin	38.5	37.9	46.2	39.7	43.3
Hancock	43.5	45.9	56.1	44.6	45.4
Knox	54.4	59.9	59.0	52.7	55.4
Lincoln	46.0	51.7	57.9	46.6	46.0
Piscataquis	38.5	45.4	55.2	39.5	44.6
Waldo	48.9	47.7	52.7	42.5	47.2
York	41.8	43.1	49.2	42.3	43.4

Source: Annual Register of Maine.

In the case of the most populous counties of Cumberland, Kennebec, and Penobscot, the Democrats actually lost ground, ending the decade with a smaller percentage of the vote than they began with, even though the actual numbers were greater.

President Wilson carried only five counties in losing to Hughes in the presidential election of 1916, by 5,379 votes statewide. They were Androscoggin, Hancock, Knox, Waldo, and York.⁹⁴ No Maine county would stray from the Republican ranks in presidential politics again until 1932.

Democratic Victories of the 1930's

Following the Democratic victories of the beginning and of the second decade of the 1900's, Maine returned to Republican control in all of its elective political offices, barring occasional elections to the Maine Legislature.

During the 1920's the Republican Party averaged 69.8 per cent of the vote in presidential elections, 64.3 per cent of the vote in United States Senate races, and 63.3 per cent of the vote in U. S. House of Representative contests. The governor's elections proved to be more competitive, but only slightly so. The Republican winners averaged 61.2 per cent of the vote, but in the elections of 1924 and 1926, the Democrats gained 42.8 and 44.5 per cent of the vote, respectively.

⁹⁴The counties of Hancock, Knox, and Waldo would become the "most" Republican in the following decades.

Voter turnout increased with women being given the right to vote in 1920. The five governor's races averaged 206,693. In 1928 for the first time since 1848, more voters turned out for the presidential election in November than did the earlier September election for governor.

The new women's vote was said to have benefited the Republican Party because of the prohibition issue. Women voted for the Republican Party because of its stronger stand for prohibition at a time when national opinion had moved toward prohibition.⁹⁵

The Republican Party through its stand on prohibition gained the support of the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Grange.⁹⁶ The tariff and the Fernald Law were other issues which gained the Republicans support.

The Lancaster analysis of the comparative party strengths of the two parties indicated that the bulk of the Democratic strength was among the foreign born, particularly those in the cities. Democrats had control in the cities of Lewiston, Waterville, Bath, Belfast, and Brunswick. They had chances in Eastport and Biddeford.⁹⁷ He further states that the numbers amounted to approximately 100,000, half of which were French-speaking. The Irish and French Canadians tended to be Democrats because they were recruited by the minority party and had

⁹⁵Lane W. Lancaster, "The Democratic Party in Maine," National Municipal Review, 18 (1929): pp. 744-749.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 746.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 747.

liberal leanings. Democrats in rural areas tended to be Jeffersonian Democrats.

The governors election of 1924 was an interesting election because of the issues involved and because its voting pattern somewhat approaches that of more recent years. Ralph O. Brewster of Portland -- he would later legally change his name to Owen Brewster -- was the Republican candidate opposed to the Democrat William R. Pattangall of Augusta. Brewster was widely believed to be the candidate of the Ku Klux Klan. The Klan was alleged to have upwards of 15,000 members and had become attracted to Brewster through his stand opposing use of public funds for parochial schools. Brewster had proposed a constitutional amendment to prohibit the use of public funds in such a manner.⁹⁸

The Klan's center was in Portland, but its influence, based on opposition to Catholics, particularly from French Canada, and support of prohibition, was statewide. They got involved in municipal reform in Portland and its Klan-endorsed tickets broke traditional Democratic control in Saco and Rockland.⁹⁹

Brewster was opposed in the Republican primary by the State Senate President, Frank Farrington, and after a bitter campaign and a recounted vote was pronounced the winner by 581 votes. In the general election that brought national attention to Maine, William Pattangall,

⁹⁸David M. Chalmers, Hooded Americanism: The First Century of the Ku Klux Klan, 1856-1956 (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1965), p. 275.

⁹⁹Ibid.

an avowed foe of Klanism, was selected to be the candidate of the Democrats.

In a September election that brought out nearly 75,000 more voters than the previous election, Ralph O. Brewster was elected governor by gaining 57.2 per cent of the vote. He carried every county but Androscoggin, but as the following Table 15 shows, something of the later voting pattern was apparent.

The election of 1924 showed substantial increases for the Democratic Party, but more than matched by corresponding Republican increase. Pattangall polled nearly 11,200 more votes than the Democratic candidate for the U. S. Senate, Fulton J. Redman, and 10,771 more votes than the combined total of Democratic candidates for the U. S. House of Representatives. This indicated something of a crossover vote from disgruntled Republicans.

The presidential race, with a fall-off of nearly 62,000 votes went easily to President Coolidge who captured 72 per cent of the vote. The Progressive Party's candidate, Robert LaFollette, made little impact in Maine, gaining but 6.1 per cent of the vote. Most of LaFollette's support came from organized labor, with Androscoggin, Cumberland, Penobscot, and York providing 61 per cent of his total.

Although Governor Brewster managed to separate himself from the Klan and to develop an image of a reform governor, the Klan remained active in his re-election in 1926. Further, it took on a rival for Brewster's possible run for the U. S. Senate in 1928, Republican Arthur Gould. Not only did Gould have a Catholic wife, if he won in 1926, it

TABLE 15

Analysis of 1924
Election of Governor

<u>Counties</u>	<u>% Vote For Democratic Candidate</u>	<u>Vote Increase Over 1922</u>	<u>% of Increase For Democrat</u>
Androscoggin	50.7	4,760	30.1
Aroostook	47.4	10,427	61.1
York	44.1	7,259	46.6
Kennebec	43.6	5,743	50.4
Washington	43.8	2,358	23.3
Somerset	42.3	1,885	25.4
Penobscot	41.9	14,014	42.9
Oxford	41.8	2,377	35.2
Cumberland	41.5	15,635	47.6
State	(42.8)	(74,938)	(44.5)

These counties represent 66 per cent of the increased voter turnout.

Source: Annual Register of Maine.

would mean that Brewster, who had moved to Dexter to improve his chances of running, would be blocked by the unwritten rule that Maine's two Senators couldn't come from the same section of the state.¹⁰⁰ Gould survived Klan charges of excessive spending in the primary election against a Klan supported candidate, and won the election by capturing 67 per cent of the vote in the election to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Fernald.

Following the Gould setback, the Klan's influence in Maine's politics declined rapidly, but Brewster suffered a major defeat in the Republican primary in 1928 in a bid for the U. S. Senate seat. Hounded by accusations of Klan support and corruption, Brewster was defeated easily by Frederick Hale.¹⁰¹ Brewster did not win his Senate seat until 1940 in a victory over Louis J. Brann.

The issues of Maine politics in the late 1920's were the attempt by the Republican "Ring" to get the 1911 Direct Primary Act repealed and the further attempts by the electrical power conglomerate, controlled by Samuel Insull, to repeal part of the Fernald Law.¹⁰² The special referendum on the repeal of the Direct Primary Act failed by a vote of 2 - 1, primarily on the efforts of Governor Brewster.

Briefly stated, the Insull interests became involved in Maine electrical power development in 1925 by the purchase of Central Maine

¹⁰⁰Chalmers, p. 277.

¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 278.

¹⁰²Hebert, pp. 69-70.

Power Company through two of its major stockholders, Walter S. Wyman and Guy P. Gannett. The purchase was made by the Middle West Utilities Company, the top holding company of the Insulls.¹⁰³ Shortly afterward the New England Public Service Company was organized in Maine as a major subholding company, with Wyman as its head. The company exercised control over several electric companies in northern New England. There was an attempt by Insull to control power rates and generating facilities and to consolidate other industrial activities. A number of mills, including Hill Manufacturing, Bates Manufacturing, and York Manufacturing were purchased by the New England Public Service Company. Later a financial holding company run by Wyman, Gannet, and associates controlled fourteen banks with resources of more than \$80 million.¹⁰⁴

Early in 1927 an attempt by the Maine Legislature to pass a bill proposing a referendum on the Fernald Law was vetoed by Governor Brewster.¹⁰⁵ Proponents then waited for a new, more pliable governor to be elected. In 1928 Governor Tudor Gardiner caused the Smith-Carleton Bill, which authorized the sale of electricity outside of the state upon approval of the Public Utilities Commission, to go to referendum. Although the Gannett newspapers conducted a massive publicity campaign and the New England Public Service Company spent \$200,000 in

¹⁰³Smith, pp. 74-79. Also Thomas L. Gaffney, "A Study of Maine Elections, 1930-1936" (M. A. Thesis, University of Maine, Orono, 1968), pp. 5-9.

¹⁰⁴Gaffney, pp. 9-10.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 11.

its behalf, the referendum lost by 10,000 votes.¹⁰⁶

The Democratic Party had been shattered by the election of 1928, the candidacy of Al Smith, his religion, and prohibition. A number of prominent Democrats, including William Pattangall, bolted the party.¹⁰⁷ President Hoover defeated Smith by polling 68.6 per cent of the vote and the Republican gubernatorial candidate, William T. Gardiner, defeated Democrat Edward C. Moran, Jr. by taking 69.3 per cent of the vote. The November presidential election saw an increase of voters by 48,545, but 65.7 per cent of these were Republican. The Republican candidates for the U. S. Senate and House of Representatives won easily.

It was left up to Edward C. Moran, Jr. of Rockland to rebuild the Democratic Party, which he did with the assistance of a split in the Republican ranks. The dissidents were led by Major Benjamin Blanchard of Bangor and State Senator Paul Slocum of Standish who condemned misuse of funds by state committee, the influence of industrial leaders in the party, and the State Highway Department scandals.¹⁰⁸

Running as the Democratic candidate for governor, Moran increased the Democratic vote to 45 per cent in an election that saw the Republican totals fall by 66,000 from the previous election. The Republican vote in Androscoggin, Cumberland, Kennebec, Penobscot, and

¹⁰⁶Ibid., pp. 15-17.

¹⁰⁷Hebert, p. 269.

¹⁰⁸Gaffney, pp. 19-28.

York Counties fell from approximately 95,000 votes to 50,000, a decrease of 53 per cent. Moran's improvement was not translated into similar Democratic gains elsewhere but the Democratic candidate, Albert Beliveau, captured 43.7 per cent of the vote in his second congressional district race.

The Republican ineptitude continued and provided the means for the Democratic victories of 1932. The Wyman-Gannett empire, Financial Institutions, Inc., went bankrupt in 1931. The Republican state government increased its expenditures by 53 per cent from 1930 to 1932, mostly for roads and highways and refused \$1.6 million in federal aid, even though the depression had hit hard, particularly in pulp and paper, potatoes, railroads, textiles, boat and shoe industries and fisheries.¹⁰⁹

Both parties had wide open, five-way primaries for the gubernatorial nomination in 1932. Louis J. Brann, six-term mayor of Lewiston, lawyer, judge, member of the Maine House of Representatives, "called the greatest Maine booster in the history of the state,"¹¹⁰ and leader of the Androscoggin Democratic Party, won the Democratic primary by 5,644 over his closest pursuer. Six thousand of his votes came from Androscoggin County. The Republicans selected Burleigh Martin of Augusta, the "Ring" candidate.

The Democratic candidates received financial help from the national party and gained some money from the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment for their stand for repeal, but prohibition was

¹⁰⁹Ibid., pp. 51-57.

¹¹⁰Hebert, p. 320.

overshadowed by economic conditions.

Brann won by 2,358 votes, but he refused to pose for photographers until assured there was not a mistake.¹¹¹ Democratic candidates Moran, in the second district, and John A. Utterback, in the third district, won their elections. The GOP vote count was smaller than 1928 in all sixteen counties, with Brann carrying the six counties of Androscoggin, Kennebec, Oxford, Sagadahoc, Somerset, and Waldo. Brann's winning margin in Androscoggin County alone was 7,577 votes.

The presidential election saw an increased turnout of 57,349 votes, but 83 per cent of the additional voters were Republican, so President Hoover carried Maine by 55.8 per cent of the vote.

One observer attributed the surprising Democratic success to a number of factors: dissatisfaction with Hoover, the depression, prohibition, and the appeal and aggressive campaign of the Democratic candidates.¹¹²

Additional support from a number of Maine newspapers, the Bangor Commercial being particularly important, and the assistance of an increasing number of industrialists, including Newell of Bath Iron Works, Campbell of Palm Beach Clothes, Burt of the shoe industry, Cushman of Cushman Bakery, and McNicoll, an Eastport packer, helped Governor Brann increase his vote total by 35,759 votes in 1934. He won by 23,503 votes, capturing 54.1 per cent of the total. The GOP

¹¹¹Caffney, p. 87.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 91.

candidate, Alfred Ames of Machias, carried only Hancock, Lincoln, Penobscot, Waldo, Aroostook, and Franklin Counties. Brann increased his vote in York County by 50 per cent and in Cumberland by 35 per cent.¹¹³

In the congressional races, the Democrat, Simon M. Hamlin, defeated the GOP incumbent by 1,600 votes. Moran was re-elected, but John G. Utterback was beaten by Ralph O. Brewster. Republican Frederick Hale narrowly retained his Senate seat by 1,200 votes. Some 12,303 fewer votes were cast in the Senate election than in the governor's race. Of the 49,554 additional votes over the 1932 election, 35,757 voters or 72 per cent voted for Brann.

The year 1936 was the Democrats' year to have internal dissension. Governor Brann wanted to run for the U. S. Senate, but was opposed by F. Harold Dubord who had lost narrowly to Hale in 1934. Dubord withdrew and agreed to run for governor. A fight with Brann over patronage caused Edward Moran, Jr. to withdraw from the primaries. It was believed that Moran had been sacrificed by the national leaders who wanted Brann on the ticket.¹¹⁴

The Maine GOP received a reported \$51,000 from the Duponts, Morgans, Rockefellers, Sloans, and Archibalds with perhaps \$46,275 not in the report.¹¹⁵ The Republican presidential candidate, Alf Landon, also campaigned in Maine.

Although the voter turnout increased by some 19,000 over

¹¹³Ibid., pp. 116-118.

¹¹⁴Ibid., p. 124.

¹¹⁵Ibid., pp. 149-150.

the previous election in 1934, the Democratic vote total dropped 26,451, or 42.1 per cent of the total. President Roosevelt got only 41.5 per cent of the total in the November election as he swept every state except Maine and Vermont. Brann lost his bid for the Senate by 4,648 votes, but he outpolled F. Harold Dubord by 22,954. All of the Democratic House of Representatives candidates were defeated by their rivals.

Louis J. Brann's attempts at further high public office were thwarted. He lost his bid for governor in 1938 to incumbent Governor Lewis O. Barrows by 17,461 votes. Ralph O. Brewster defeated him in a second attempt at a U. S. Senate seat in 1940 by nearly 45,000 votes. He lost to Robert Hale in a congressional race in 1942. The brief Democratic era was over.

If the pattern of Democratic support from the 1906-1916 period is compared with the pattern of support for the Democratic Party from 1932 to 1938, we find there is little similarity.

In the first cell of four counties, which included Androscoggin, Knox, Lincoln, and Penobscot, with high support of over 50 per cent in the 1906-1916 period, only one, Androscoggin, maintained that level of support in the 1932-1938 period.

Seven counties were in the support level of 45-49 per cent in the earlier period, but two of these, Sagadahoc and Washington, went to over 50 per cent support in the later period; three remained the same, Cumberland, Kennebec, and Somerset; while two, Waldo and Hancock, dropped to the third level and fourth level of support, respectively.

In the earlier 40-44 per cent cell, two, Oxford and York,

TABLE 16

Comparison of Periods of Democratic
Success by County

<u>County Support for Demo- cratic Party 1906-1916</u>		<u>County Support for Demo- cratic Party 1932-1938</u>			
		Over 50%	45-49%	40-44%	Under 40%
Over 50%	(4)	1	1	1	1
45-49%	(7)	2	3	1	1
40-44%	(4)	2	1	1	0
Under 40%	(1)	0	0	1	0
		(5)	(5)	(4)	(2)

moved to the highest support level; Piscataquis moved to the 45-49 per cent level, and Franklin County remained the same by comparison.

Aroostook County, below the 40 per cent line in the first period, moved to the 40-44 per cent support level. Only five counties maintained their same relative position. These were Androscoggin, Cumberland, Kennebec, Somerset, and Franklin. Only Androscoggin was consistently Democratic.

One observer has estimated that the Democrats comprised about 46 per cent of the electorate for the period 1930-1940, but that seemed

high.¹¹⁶ He blames the sudden collapse of the Democratic Party in the 1930's after their successes to the failure to develop a coordinated organization through which they could perpetuate their power. The Executive Council checked the governor's appointive powers and the breach between Brann and Moran split the organization.

Webber believes that the identification of the Democratic Party with Catholicism also contributed to voter antipathy.¹¹⁷

The governors elections of 1940 to 1950 resulted in an average victory margin for the Republicans of 55,818 votes. No Democrat was elected U. S. Senator or to the U. S. House of Representatives.

In the presidential races, President Roosevelt won 48.8 per cent of the vote in 1940 and 47.4 per cent in 1944. Tom Dewey defeated President Harry Truman by 56.7 to 42.3 per cent in 1948. Androscoggin County voted Democratic in all of these, having moved into the Democratic column in 1932. Washington and York County voted for the Democratic candidate in 1936, 1940, and 1944, and York voted for Truman in 1948. Sagadahoc voted for Roosevelt in 1940 and 1944. Kennebec slipped into the Democratic column in 1940.

The New Deal-Fair Deal pattern for the Democratic vote was firmly established.

Androscoggin County voted for the Democratic candidate for governor in 1944, 1946, and 1948. York voted with Androscoggin in 1948.

¹¹⁶ Edwin Waitstell Weber, "An Evaluation of the Political History of the State of Maine (1930-1940)", (M. A. Thesis, University of Maine, 1952), p. 37.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 84.

TABLE 17

Pattern of Democratic Support
1932-1952
Selected Counties

<u>County</u>	<u>No. of Times Supporting Presidential Candidate</u>	<u>Average Per Cent of Vote</u>
Androscoggin	5	61.5
York	4	48.7
Washington	3	49.8
Sagadahoc	2	46.5
Kennebec	1	46.4

C H A P T E R III

THE MOVE TOWARD COMPETITIVE PARTIES

The Changeover

There was little to predict the Democratic victories that came in the mid-1950's. There had been a flurry of activity in the Republican primaries in 1948. Six candidates had vied for the GOP nomination for governor when the incumbent, Horace Hildreth, had decided to run for the vacated U. S. Senate seat after serving two terms in the Blaine House. Robert Hale, the incumbent congressman in the first district, had minor opposition from three opponents. The real contest was in the Republican nomination for the U. S. Senate where two former governors, Horace Hildreth and Sumner Sewall, challenged Congresswoman Margaret Chase Smith. The fourth candidate in the race was Albion P. Beverage. Margaret Chase Smith won the nomination by taking 51.9 per cent of the vote with Horace Hildreth second with 25.2 per cent of the vote. Frederick Payne won the GOP nomination for governor with only 36.1 per cent of the vote. The Republican candidates won easily in the fall elections.

In 1950 Lucia M. Cormier of Rumford gained 46 per cent of the vote in losing to Republican Robert Hale, the four-term congressman.

The 1952 elections found the Republicans in somewhat disarray. Burton M. Cross won the GOP nomination for governor in a

three-way race, gaining 40.4 per cent of the vote. Frederick G. Payne, following his two terms as governor, stepped up to challenge and beat the incumbent U. S. Senator, Owen Brewster, by a narrow margin of some 3,300 votes.¹

The victories of Margaret Chase Smith and Frederick G. Payne are generally cited as victories over Republican "machine" candidates and as evidence of the deterioration of machine control in Maine politics.²

Political mismanagement by Republican Governor Burton M. Cross set the stage for the Democratic victory in 1954. The Democrats, through hard "grass roots" campaigning, a reinvigoration of the party by Frank M. Coffin's unique drafting of party platform with genuine public involvement, and the assistance of a number of dissident Republicans, won the gubernatorial election for the first time since 1934.³ For the first time television was used in a political campaign in Maine with the Democrats making wise use of it.⁴

Muskie won 54.5 per cent of the vote, gaining a plurality of 22,375 votes. Five counties, Androscoggin, Aroostook, Kennebec, Penobscot, and York gave Muskie 21,940 votes or 98 per cent of the total.

¹Maine Almanac, p. 338. Vote totals and percentages in this section are figured from election results reported in this publication, pp. 305-348.

²Duane Lockard, New England State Politics (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1968), p. 84.

³Neal R. Pierce, The New England States: People, Politics, and Power in the Six New England States (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1976), p. 376.

⁴Ibid., p. 377.

Only Knox and Lincoln gave the Republican candidate, Cross, substantial pluralities.⁵ Those same five counties would provide a 9,678 vote plurality for Margaret Chase Smith in her re-election as United States Senator, giving rise to the saying, "Muskie Republicans." Muskie's total was nearly 36,000 more than the number of registered Democratic voters in the state. The Republicans had 262,367 enrolled voters or 54.6 per cent, while the Independents were second with 118,905 or 24.7 per cent of the registered voters.⁶ Cross's total represents only 43.2 per cent of the total number of registered Republican voters in an election that saw 51.8 per cent of the registered voters turn out, the lowest turnout for any election during the 1954-1974 period.

Senator Smith ran ahead of Burton M. Cross in every county by an average of 4,052 votes. The largest voter shifts occurred in Cumberland, Penobscot, Aroostook, Kennebec, and Androscoggin Counties.

Governor Muskie gained re-election in 1956 in spite of the Eisenhower Republican landslide in the November elections. President Eisenhower carried every county as he had in 1952, increasing his plurality by 33,223 votes and his winning percentage from 66 per cent to

⁵Richard Scammon, America Votes, Vol. 1, Government Affairs Institute (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1973), p. 138. The author is greatly indebted for this publication and that of America at the Polls: The Vote for President, 1924-1964, Government Affairs Institute (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1965), pp. 202-204, for the election data for this period of Maine's political history.

⁶James F. Horan, John C. Quinn, Kenneth T. Palmer, Allen C. Pease, Eugene A. Mawhinney, Downeast Politics: The Government of the State of Maine (Dubuque: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company, 1975), p. 4.

70.9 per cent. Governor Muskie, in an election that had 47,057 fewer votes cast than in the previous election, carried every county but Hancock and Lincoln with a 55,359 vote plurality. Muskie ran ahead of the Democratic presidential nominee in every county, with the greatest margin in Cumberland (14,371), Penobscot, Kennebec, York, Androscoggin, and Aroostook Counties.

More importantly for the Democratic Party, Frank Coffin defeated the Republican candidate, James L. Reid, by more than 7,000 votes to win the congressional seat in the second district. The GOP incumbent, Robert Hale, hung on to his first district congressional seat by only 29 votes.⁷ The second district race had been opened up by the retirement of Charles P. Nelson. A pattern for support of the Democratic Party had been established which would result in victories at every level and office of government, both state and federal.

A summary of party victories for the period is shown in Table 13.

Not included in the totals of Table 18 were the presidential elections of 1964 and 1968 in which the Democratic candidates carried the state for the first time since President Wilson's victory in 1912. These were the second and third victories by Democratic candidates for president since the inception of the Republican Party in the state in 1855.

In the case of the Johnson landslide in 1964, the president carried nearly every county with vote percentages of 60 per cent or

⁷Maine Almanac, p. 331.

TABLE 18

Democratic and Republican Victories
in Governor, Senate, and House Contests
1952-1972

<u>Party</u>	<u>Governor</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>House</u>
Democratic	71% (5)	47% (5)	55% (12)
Republican	29% (2)	53% (8)	45% (10)

Figures in parentheses indicate the number of party victories. Included are elections for vacancies.

Source: Annual Register of Maine.

better in rolling up a 143,563 vote plurality. Only in Hancock and Lincoln Counties did his winning percentage drop below the 60 per cent level.

Hubert Humphrey's victory in the 1968 presidential election, assisted by the presence of Senator Muskie as the vice presidential candidate, had a narrower, 48,058 vote margin with his total representing 55.3 per cent of the vote.⁸ The Democratic ticket carried all counties except the mid-coast counties of Hancock, Knox, Lincoln, and Waldo.

The Democratic presidential victory in 1964 brought with it

⁸ America Votes, Vol. 8, p. 161.

the first Democratically controlled state legislature since 1910. Republicans regained control in 1966 and stayed in control of both houses until the most recent 107th and 108th Legislatures. In these two cases, control over the legislature has been split, with the Democrats controlling the House of Representatives and the Republicans controlling the Senate. The Democrats have had the over-all numerical advantage and have selected the constitutional and statutory executive offices.⁹

Averaging the per cent of the vote gained by the Democratic candidates in the statewide elections held from 1952 to 1972 by county and ranking the counties yields the results shown in Table 19.

Table 19 reveals the pattern of Democratic support in Maine's sixteen counties for the two decades beginning in 1952, the election year prior to the Democratic breakthrough.¹⁰ Androscoggin County stands out in its support of Democratic candidates, with York and Kennebec Counties showing over 50 per cent. The largest number of counties are bunched in the 40 to 50 per cent group. The most Republican group are the four mid-coastal counties that show less than 40 per cent support of Democratic candidates.

A second way of examining the over-all support for the

⁹Under Maine's system, the legislature selects the Secretary of State, Attorney-General, State Treasurer, and the Commissioner of Agriculture, and the State Auditor. Until two years ago, the legislature also selected the Governor's Executive Council, but it has been abolished. The selection, for all practical purposes, is by the party having the majority in both houses.

¹⁰The election sample includes six presidential elections, eight U. S. Senate contests, and six gubernatorial elections.

TABLE 19

Rank Order
Average Democratic Vote by Per Cent
Statewide Offices 1952-1972

<u>County</u>	<u>Average % Democratic Vote</u>	<u>Ranking</u>
Androscoggin	63.6	1
York	53.9	2
Kennebec	50.4	3
Oxford	49.3	4
Cumberland	48.4	5.5
Somerset	48.4	5.5
Sagadahoc	47.1	7
Aroostook	46.7	8
Piscataquis	45.2	9
Penobscot	44.9	10
Washington	44.5	11
Franklin	42.9	12
Waldo	39.3	13
Knox	38.2	14
Hancock	32.5	15.5
Lincoln	32.5	15.5

Source: America Votes


Democratic Party would be to show the number of times, expressed as a per cent of the total that each county cast a plurality of more of its vote for the Democratic candidate. The results are shown in Table 20.

TABLE 20

County Support for Democratic Candidates
Statewide Elections 1952-1972

<u>County</u>	<u>Per Cent of Elections Voting Democratic</u>
Androscoggin	91.0
York	63.6
Oxford	54.5
Kennebec	50.0
Cumberland, Penobscot, Somerset	45.6
Aroostook, Piscataquis, Sagadahoc	40.9
Washington	36.4
Franklin	31.8
Knox, Waldo	22.9
Lincoln	9.0
Hancock	4.5

Source: America Votes



MAP 1

A comparison of the two Tables (19 and 20) shows only two minor differences. Oxford County has a better record of support of Democratic candidates than the first Table indicates, having supported the Democrats 54.5 per cent of the time while averaging just under 50 per cent average in the vote. Penobscot County has a slightly better rate of support of Democratic candidates than its average vote might indicate.

The question arises, once the level of support for Democratic candidates is established, whether the general trend is the same for all the elections under study, both on a statewide basis and on a county to county basis. The question can be examined by graphing the Democratic vote for the elections under consideration. Figure 1 shows the voting pattern of the Democratic voters from 1952 to 1972. The early peak was brought by the victory of Edmund Muskie in the governor's race in 1954. The second peaks were brought by Muskie's second gubernatorial victory and his victory as the first elected Democratic Senator in Maine since the Civil War. The third peak represents the Democratic landslide with President Johnson in 1964 and Muskie's re-election as Senator. The corresponding valleys are the re-election of Senator Margaret Chase Smith.

The graphing of a sample of the counties with the state configuration indicates that the counties have followed the same pattern as the state has, see Figure 2. An interesting fact shown by the graphs is that the voting trend with the counties having low records of support for Democratic candidates such as Hancock and Lincoln show a trend




FIGURE 1
DEMOCRATIC VOTE
ALL ELECTIONS, 1952 - 1972




FIGURE 2
DEMOCRATIC VOTE, ALL ELECTIONS
State and Selected Counties
1952 - 1972

toward higher support of Democratic candidates than do the high Democratic support counties.

By breaking the total graph down into its component parts (Figures 3, 4, and 5), it is possible to isolate some of the short run factors that have contributed to the over-all picture of Democratic support. The most obvious factor in Maine's presidential elections (Figure 3) was the Democratic landslide of 1964. Without that, the graphs would be much flatter. Further, it is interesting to note that at the end of the twenty year period York and Androscoggin, as high Democratic support counties, had return to the levels of the 1950's. This could be because of the nature of the 1972 presidential election, with the Nixon landslide nearly as disastrous to the Democrats as the 1964 election had been to the Republicans. Had the graph been extended to the 1976 presidential election, it would have the four counties and the state graphs with a higher finish.¹¹

The graph of the U. S. Senate elections (Figure 4) shows the alternative influence of Senator Muskie and Senator Smith. The high peaks are the successful Muskie elections, and the valleys are the victories of Senator Smith. The leveling influence at the end represents the victory of the Democrat, William Hathaway, over Senator Smith by 53.2 per cent to 46.8 per cent, giving Maine two Democratic Senators.

The graph of the governor's elections (Figure 5) is

¹¹ Androscoggin cast 60.7 per cent of its vote for President Carter; York, 52.6 per cent; Lincoln, 37.7 per cent; and Hancock, 34.3 per cent.




FIGURE 3

DEMOCRATIC VOTE FOR PRESIDENT
State and Selected Counties
1952 - 1972




FIGURE 4
DEMOCRATIC VOTE FOR U.S. SENATOR
State and Selected Counties
1952 - 1972




FIGURE 5
 DEMOCRATIC VOTE FOR GOVERNOR
 State and Selected Counties
 1952 - 1972

considerably different, without the peaks and valleys of the other graphs. There is the absence of an extremely popular chief executive, unlike Maine's successful Senators, and there is not the influence of major presidential landslides, such as the 1964 or 1972 presidential elections. The influence of the 1960 presidential election is seen for it was the first time for Maine's elections to all be held on the November date. Both were reasonably close elections. Given the lack of external influences and exceedingly popular individuals holding the position of governor, the vote for governor may be a closer approximation of the relative party strengths than the other elections or a combination of elections.

Clearly contradicting the conclusion that the statistics shown in the governor's elections are the best indicators of relative party strengths is the closeness of the governor's elections from 1952-1972. Five were won by Democrats, two by Muskie and two by Curtis with the fifth by Clauson; but two required recounts, 1962 and 1970.

The average Republican vote for governor was 48.2 per cent, and that of the Democrats 49.9 per cent. The average winning plurality was 17,730, distorted somewhat by Muskie's winning margin of 55,859 in 1956.¹² As will be seen later, actual voting registration figures do not bear out the closeness of party strength as indicated by the gubernatorial contests. A large number of the contests developed hotly debated issues, relating to industrial development and jobs, taxes, and the general notion that the Republicans had been in office too long.

¹²America Votes, Vol. 2, p. 155.

The Rate of Political Change

Equally as important to the task of examining political change within the state is the examination of the rate of change.¹³ Essentially the measure will show the amount of change in the percentage of vote for candidates of the Democratic Party for the elections of the 1952-1972 period. For instance, the rate of change of the vote for Democratic candidates for the state in all election categories is shown in Table 21.

TABLE 21

Change in Democratic Vote, State
1952-1972

All statewide elections	16.55%
Presidential elections	18.65
Senatorial elections	15.26
Gubernatorial elections	6.44

¹³The procedure used to measure change was to calculate the slope of the line of regression for each county for each category of election, Presidential, Gubernatorial, and Senatorial, together with a composite. The value for the slope was then multiplied by the number of elections. The procedure is described in V. O. Key, Jr., A Primer of Statistics for Political Scientists (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Inc., 1966), p. 74-81. The author was introduced to the procedure in GT. 720 at the University of Massachusetts.

The information verifies the previous discussion that there has been a substantial increase in the Democratic vote over two decades. The advance has been led by the Democratic vote in presidential elections, followed closely by the elections for U. S. Senator. The governors' elections, although showing positive growth for the Democratic vote, have shown much less dramatic growth in Democratic strength than have the other elections. The findings further substantiate an earlier conclusion that the elections for governor have been a different consideration with different influences.

A composite of the rate of change in the Democratic vote for all elections with the subsequent rankings for all counties is developed in Table 22.

The composite, as shown in the table, reveals a number of interesting facets of the growth of Democratic strength but no over-all patterns. The highest rate of change in the governor's elections, Androscoggin with 8.41 per cent, is about half that of other elections. Six counties have actually had decreases over the twenty year period.


In terms of consistent performances, Cumberland and Franklin Counties have the greatest over-all improvements in the performance of the Democratic Party. Cumberland, the most populous of Maine's counties, is especially important for the Democratic cause. In some instances, the most Republican of the counties have shown substantial improvement, such as Waldo and Lincoln in the presidential elections. Even Knox and Hancock have shown well.

For the most part, the traditionally Democratic counties have

TABLE 22

Comparisons of Rate of Change
Democratic Vote, Statewide Elections
1952-1972

<u>County</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Pres.</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Gov.</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Sen.</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Androscoggin	15.12	9	15.05	15	8.41	1	16.11	10
Aroostook	18.27	3	17.90	12	4.41	7	24.72	1
Cumberland	18.69	2	23.05	2	6.77	3	18.89	4
Franklin	19.11	1	22.30	4	8.17	2	19.38	3
Hancock	14.07	10	21.13	7	-0.56	12	16.74	8
Kennebec	10.08	15	16.27	14	-1.75	15	11.06	14
Knox	15.96	7	21.20	6	4.46	6	15.62	11
Lincoln	18.06	4.5	23.00	3	-1.05	13	17.19	6
Oxford	15.57	8	18.79	10	6.72	4	16.77	7
Penobscot	18.06	4.5	22.03	5	3.87	8	21.88	2
Piscataquis	13.65	11	19.60	8	-0.07	11	16.30	9
Sagadahoc	10.92	14	18.93	9	2.60	9	7.16	15
Somerset	11.97	13	18.76	11	-3.47	16	14.91	12
Waldo	11.97	12	23.67	1	-1.23	14	11.40	13
Washington	15.96	6	16.67	13	5.17	5	18.27	5
York	6.50	16	12.24	16	1.26	10	3.16	16



MAP 2

had a lower rate of change than the other counties. The exceptions are Androscoggin and Oxford Counties in support of the Democratic candidates for governor. York, the second most Democratic County behind Androscoggin, is ranked last in all election categories but gubernatorial.

By far, the greatest Democratic gains have come in the group of six counties of medium support for Democratic candidates. This is the case both in terms of per cent of the vote, the range is 42.9 to 48.4 per cent of the vote, and a record of support of Democratic candidates, with the range of 31.8 to 45.6 per cent of the time. These counties include Cumberland, Aroostook, Penobscot, and Franklin without exception. Washington and Piscataquis Counties show medium to high rates of increase in three of four of the election categories. Both Somerset and Sagadahoc Counties have fallen toward the lower rate of change in more than half the categories.

Voter Registrations

An analysis of voter registrations for the period 1954 to 1974 shows the gradualness of the buildup of the Democratic Party and the loss of superior numbers by the Republicans. Table 23 illustrates this fact.

The GOP enjoyed a majority of the registered voters until 1960, when it fell below 50 per cent for the first time. The table further indicates that the Republicans lost voters to the Independents as well as

TABLE 23

Democratic and Republican Voters
Total Voter Registration

<u>Year</u>	<u>Registered Voters</u>	<u>Per Cent Rep.</u>	<u>Per Cent Dem.</u>	<u>Per Cent Ind.</u>
1954	480,658	54.6	20.7	24.7
1956	485,960	51.6	21.3	27.1
1958	483,875	52.2	23.2	24.7
1960	537,922	46.0	22.1	31.9
1962	496,029	48.7	27.0	24.3
1964	522,236	45.8	26.6	27.6
1966	509,888	45.8	30.9	23.3
1968	529,137	42.9	30.3	26.7
1970	522,044	42.7	32.7	24.5
1972	576,915	41.5	33.1	25.4
1974	631,873	36.1	33.6	30.4

Source: Downeast Politics, p. 4.¹⁴

¹⁴Downeast Politics shows the number of enrolled Democratic and Republican voters for each year and the total number of registered voters. The Independent vote was obtained by subtracting the number of enrolled voters from the number of registered voters, leaving the number of unenrolled voters -- the Independents. Figures for 1978 show the Democratic Party to lead the Republican Party, 35.3 per cent to 33.6 per cent.

the Democrats. Over-all the Republicans suffered a net loss of 34,539 enrolled voters for the period, some 13 per cent of their total. The Democrats gained 112,789 voters, 113.4 per cent of their total in 1954. Independents, or non-enrolled voters, increased by 72,965, some 60 per cent.

A remarkable feature of the Maine voting scene has been the number of Independent voters, which averaged 26.5 per cent of the registered voters during the period. There is a general increase in the number of Independents during each presidential year.

It is apparent that the Democratic Party lacked sufficient numbers of its own enrolled voters to win statewide elections by themselves. They needed support from the Independents and, in some cases, Republicans crossing over to split their ticket. The presidential election year of 1964 was a turning point in Democratic enrollments for the following election year showed a jump of some 18,815 or 13.6 per cent of the previous total for Democrats. Since there was a decline in the number of registered voters, the Democratic gains came primarily from the Independents.

The Republican losses in enrollments occurred at three separate times, at the presidential election years of 1960 and 1968, and the off-year elections of 1974. In the 1960 presidential year, in spite of an increase of 54,047 registered voters over the previous election year, the Republicans had 5,129 less enrolled voters. The election year of 1968 brought out an additional 19,249 voters; but the GOP showed a loss of 6,200 enrolled voters. In the off-year election of 1974,

featuring the election of an Independent governor, James Longley, the Republicans lost 11,706 enrolled voters in spite of a sizeable 54,958 increase in the number of registered voters. Apparently the Independents gained more from GOP losses than did the Democrats, as can be seen in Table 24.

TABLE 24

Enrolled and Independent Voters
Gains and Losses
Selected Elections

<u>Year</u>	<u>Increase in Registered Voters</u>	<u>Gains and Losses</u>		
		<u>Rep.</u>	<u>Dem.</u>	<u>Ind.</u>
1960	54,047	- 5,129	+ 6,982	+52,194
1968	19,249	- 6,200	+ 2,858	+22,591
1974	54,958	-11,706	+21,344	+45,320

In a number of instances it appears that the big increase in voters that occurs periodically in the ranks of the Independents is passed on, in part at least, to the Democratic Party. Earlier in the period the non-enrolled voter category seemed to be an alternative to enrolling as a Democrat. Later on the Independent voter may have acted as a transfer category.

Examining the voter registrations on a county by county basis, but on a period base of 1958-1974,¹⁵ we find that only five counties showed net increases in Republican enrollments for the period. These were York County, a Democratic stronghold; Cumberland County, a county becoming more supportive of Democratic candidates; Franklin County, showing a high rate of change for the Democrats; and the two Republican Counties of Hancock and Knox. All counties had increases in Democratic enrollments and all but two counties, Franklin and Oxford, had increases in the number of non-enrolled voters. These two had decreases of 7.5 per cent and 5.4 per cent respectively. All counties showed an increase in registered voters, but of varying degrees. Cumberland and Penobscot both had increases of over 40 per cent, while Washington County had an increase of less than 5 per cent. Both of these indicate a difference in population age rather than gains or losses in population in general.

The development of a composite which combines previously discussed material concerning the rate of change of the vote for the Democratic candidates with the statistics on voter enrollments and registrations does not reveal a clear-cut pattern of trends, but rather a number of cross-cutting patterns, from which it is difficult to draw conclusions.

For the most part, counties with high Republican enrollments

¹⁵The period of 1958-1974 was selected because of the availability of data. However, it would appear from statewide data that no major changes took place in either 1954 or 1956. See complete data in Appendix B.

TABLE 25

Composite Voter Enrollments
Rates of Change by County

<u>Counties With High Change Rate</u>	<u>High % Rep.</u>	<u>High % Rep. Change</u>	<u>High % Dem.</u>	<u>High % Dem. Change</u>	<u>High % Ind.</u>	<u>High % Ind. Change</u>	<u>High % Change Reg. Voters</u>
Franklin	X						
Cumberland				X	X	X	X
Aroostook		X	X	X			
Lincoln	X			X		X	X
Penobscot				X		X	X
Washington	X	X	X				
Knox	X				X		
<u>Counties With Low Change Rate</u>							
Waldo	X				X	X	X
Somerset		X	X		X	X	
Sagadahoc				X			X
Kennebec		X		X		X	X
York			X		X		
<u>Counties With Moderate Change Rate</u>							
Oxford		X	X		X		
Androscoggin			X				
Hancock	X						
Piscataquis	X	X				X	

have been undergoing change, both in the direction of support for Democratic candidates and changes in Democratic enrollments. A secondary move is toward the Independent category. Lincoln and Knox have shown this tendency. Washington County's high ranking in both Republican and Democratic enrolled voters has resulted in its lowest portion of Independent voters.¹⁶

Counties with low rates of change toward the Democratic Party tend to have high Democratic enrollments or high rates of change toward Democratic enrollments. These counties show large percentages of un-enrolled voters and high incidences of change over the period toward non-enrolled voters. The one County with a high GOP enrollment, Waldo, indicates a movement toward the Independent voter.

The counties having a high per cent of increase in the number of registered voters are evenly divided between the category showing a high rate of change toward support of Democratic candidates and that showing a low rate of change, indicating perhaps a stability of voting patterns in the latter case not experienced in the former.

Six counties which have a high loss of Republican enrollments are found at all three levels of change in the Democratic vote and follow no exact pattern, although in four of the six cases, the change is toward a category of high Democratic enrollments.

Obviously, the situation is not simply one of Republicans becoming Democrats. In some cases this may be the case, but it is also

¹⁶ Rates of change figures are From Table 22. The percentages of Republicans, Democrats, and Independents and their changes are calculated from voter registration data in Appendix B.

apparent that there is movement by both parties into the Independent category. It also appears that numbers of newly registered voters begin in the Independent category and shift to one of the parties, most likely the Democratic Party. A further complicating factor may be a recent shift, noted in recent enrollment figures from both political parties toward non-enrollment. The Democrats became the majority party for the first time in 1978, but both the Republicans and Democrats lost ground to the Independents, who increased by some 18 per cent since the 1976 totals.¹⁷

¹⁷Portland Evening Express, July 22, 1978, p. 3. The Democratic Party had 234,701 or 35.3 per cent of the total of registered voters; the Republicans had 223,824 or 33.6 per cent; and the Independents had 207,266 or 31.1 per cent.

CHAPTER IV

THE SEARCH FOR DEMOCRATIC STRENGTH

Introduction

A number of observers have cited various causes for the resurgence of the Democratic Party in Maine. Duane Lockard found the role of the Franco-Americans to be a telling factor, together with other minorities such as the Irish-Americans and an increasing percentage of laborers engaged in manufacturing.¹ Neal R. Pierce, citing publisher John Cole, observed the impact of the new campus liberal, the intellectuals, and middle class protestants as newer segments of the Democratic Party.² James L. Sundquist, in his Dynamics of the Party System, credited the rise of the programmatic liberal Democrat, as exemplified by Edmund Muskie, as the underlying factor in the improvement of the fortunes of the Democrats.³ Our earlier discussion indicated a

¹Lockard, pp. 96-99.

²Pierce, p. 380.

³James L. Sundquist, Dynamics of the Party Systems (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1973), p. 242.

number of factors which have tended to maintain Republican control in the state.

An attempt to more carefully delineate the boundaries of support for the Democratic Party was conducted through the medium of simple correlation coefficients.⁴ A total of twenty-nine socio-economic variables were included in the analysis, some spanning the 1940 to 1970 time period, but mostly from 1950 to 1970 and 1960 to 1970. These were correlated with the per cent of the vote gained by the Democratic candidate in each statewide election from 1952 to 1972, the average Democratic vote, and the per cent change in Democratic vote for each of the categories of elections.⁵ The data was collected on a county basis for the sixteen Maine Counties.

An Analysis of the Socio-Economic Variables

A total of seven socio-economic variables were used to measure the effects of ethnicity and, indirectly, the impact of the Franco-American vote. These were per cent of the population that is foreign born, per cent of the population with foreign or mixed parentage, and per cent of the population that is foreign stock. These variables are interrelated and to some degree measure the same thing, particularly

⁴The computer program at the University of Massachusetts is the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version 6.0.

⁵A complete listing of the variables can be found in Appendix A.

foreign stock, which is a composite of foreign born and foreign or mixed parentage. The inter-relationships can be seen in Table 26.

TABLE 26

Inter-Correlations of Measures of Ethnicity

	<u>For. Born 1960</u>	<u>For. Born 1970</u>	<u>For. Mixed 1960</u>	<u>For. Mixed 1970</u>	<u>For. Stock 1960</u>	<u>For. Stock 1970</u>
For. Born, 1940	.906	.816	.964	.918	.956	.900
For. Born, 1960		.967	.953	.971	.976	.979
For. Born, 1970			.905	.953	.932	.973
For./Mixed, 1960				.979	.996	.969
For./Mixed, 1970					.986	.997
Foreign Stock, 1960						.981
Pearson Correlation Coefficients						

As can be seen, foreign stock is the more encompassing variable, and therefore a more accurate variable for our use, but it should be noted that for particular elections each of these components of ethnicity have seemed to act independently from the others.

Two of the socio-economic variables concern occupational status, that of per cent of population engaged in manufacturing and per cent of the population in white collar occupations. The first of these has been

cited as being closely connected with the Democratic vote in Maine and elsewhere; whereas the white collar occupations have tended to support the GOP nationally. These tend to show a negative relationship with one another in the range of $-.266$ to $-.727$.⁶

Two income variables were included, that of median family income, and that of per cent with family income over \$10,000. Observers have cited income as being relevant to political party identification, with lower income levels tending to vote for the Democratic Party and upper income levels tending to vote for the Republican Party. There was an inter-relationship among the variables with the 1970 median income having a correlation with 1960 median family income of $.876$ and with 1970 family income over \$10,000 of $.868$. The 1960 median family income correlated with the 1960 family income over \$10,000 by $.936$. In addition, 1970 median family income had a relationship of $.629$ with white collar occupations, 1970, and per cent urban of both 1960 and 1970.

The urban-rural population dichotomy was examined through the variable per cent of the population living in urban areas in 1960 and 1970. There was a strong relationship of $.958$ between 1960 and 1970 urban populations, indicating only limited change. Actually there was a loss of population in central cities and urbanized areas in Maine between 1960 and 1970 with a gain of 8.7 per cent in the urban fringe.

⁶It is important to keep in mind that the data is arranged by counties; therefore the relationship being discussed is a place relationship. In other words, the white collar occupations are not found, for the most part, in the counties having manufacturing occupations.

The greatest gain came in rural places of 1,000 to 2,500.⁷ The urbanism variable showed a moderate relationship with most of the measures of ethnicity, which was to be expected because of the location of the bulk of the ethnic population in urban areas, as was previously noted. There was also a moderate relationship of urbanism with the income variables, indicating that higher incomes were in the urban areas.⁸

One religious variable, that of per cent of the population that is Catholic, was used.⁹ As was expected, there was a high relationship with all measures of ethnicity. Franco-Americans are strongly Catholic and make up the largest ethnic group in the state. There was a moderate relationship between per cent Catholic and the per cent urban variable, indicating that the tendency is for the Catholic population to be found in the urban areas.

Two other sets of variables were used to measure additional aspects of Maine's population. The median age variable for the years 1950 to 1970 was used to discover the effect of the out migration of youthful

⁷U. S. Census, 1970, p. 39.

⁸The writer arbitrarily, partly through previous experience, set limits for the relationships obtained through the correlation coefficients. Any value over .90 was considered to have a very high relationship between variables; any value of .80 to .90 was considered high; values between .50 and .80 was medium or moderate; values between .30 - .50 was low; and any value under .30 was not considered. Some consideration was given to negative correlations of fairly high values.

⁹There was difficulty in obtaining recent, accurate information concerning this variable on a county by county basis. Census figures for 1926 and 1936 were used and hence may detract from the accuracy of the findings. The more recent Churches and Church Membership in the United States, by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, was not available.

population which some observers have noted as a cause of Maine's Republicanism. An educational variable, median school years completed, attempted to measure the relationship of education to partisan choice. The general belief is that populations with lesser amounts of education, high school and below, tend to vote for the Democratic Party. There was some minor relationship between the two sets of variables, usually of .40 or lower. There was a stronger, but negative relationship between median age and the measures of ethnicity and Catholicism, which suggests that the older population is more likely to be anglo-saxon and Protestant, although Maine's population as a whole is getting younger to a slight degree.

Four change variables were developed from the United States Census data for the years 1960 and 1970. These were expressed in per cents and involved the change in per cent of the population in manufacturing, the change in urban population, the change in foreign stock, and the change in population size.

The inter-relationships of the four variables measuring change in the socio-economic structure of Maine's population can be seen in Table 27.

The limited aspect of the relationships can be seen; and it would indicate that, for the most part, the changes are occurring independent of each other. In general, there has been a reduction in per cent in manufacturing, the per cent of the population in urban areas and the per cent in foreign stock, but in all cases these changes have been minor, showing 1.6 per cent, 0.5 per cent, and 3.9 per cent

TABLE 27

Interrelationships of Variables
Measuring Change in Population
Characteristics 1960-1970

	<u>Chg. In Urbanism</u>	<u>Chg. In Foreign Stock</u>	<u>Chg. In Population</u>
Change in Manufacturing	.584	.391	.132
Change in Urbanism		.284	.054
Change in Foreign Stock			.152

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

respectively. Population change has been positive, but again to the limited degree of 2.4 per cent. Given the negative nature of the changes, and, upon inspection of the original data, the correlations would seem to indicate that the losses in manufacturing employment and foreign stock have been occurring in the urban areas. This fact is in keeping with the findings of the general population trends.

An Analysis of the Election Variables

There were twenty-two statewide elections held during the period of time spanned by 1952 to 1972. The elections contained six presidential elections, eight elections for U. S. Senator, and eight elections for governor. These, together with average Democratic vote, per cent change

in Democratic vote for President, per cent change in Democratic vote for governor, and per cent change in Democratic vote for Senator, constitute the election variables. Correlations with the socio-economic variables were calculated as were correlations among the election variables themselves.

An attempt was made to compare voting patterns within and between election categories.¹⁰ In general, it was found that the Democratic vote patterns were most similar in presidential elections. With the exception of the presidential election of 1964, all presidential elections correlated with the other presidential elections at a level of .922 or more.

There was a great deal more variation in the internal consistency of the senatorial and gubernatorial elections. Apparently it made little difference whether the two elections being compared shared common party victories. The results are shown in Tables 28 and 29.

Apparently Maine's gubernatorial elections have shown a greater consistency, particularly in the elections from 1958 on, than have the senatorial elections. There seems to be little impact of which party wins. The lowest correlation between senatorial elections is the 1964 and 1972 elections, both with winning Democrats. The next lowest is between the 1952 and 1972 elections, one won by a Republican and the other by a Democrat. In fact the 1972 senatorial election appears to be the

¹⁰The understanding here is that if the Democratic vote pattern of one election is similar to that of another election there will be a high correlation coefficient. There would be no relationship to the total vote actually cast, merely whether a voting pattern in one election compared favorably with that of another election.

TABLE 28

Senatorial Election Consistency
1952-1972

	<u>1954 Senate (R)</u>	<u>1958 Senate (D)</u>	<u>1960 Senate (R)</u>	<u>1964 Senate (D)</u>	<u>1966 Senate (R)</u>	<u>1970 Senate (D)</u>	<u>1972 Senate (D)</u>
1952 Senate (R)	.848	.884	.850	.844	.806	.797	.580
1954 Senate (R)		.869	.911	.770	.885	.902	.758
1958 Senate (D)			.926	.915	.896	.908	.781
1960 Senate (R)				.854	.983	.923	.809
1964 Senate (D)					.846	.823	.579
1966 Senate (R)						.903	.811
1970 Senate (D)							.817

Pearson Correlation Coefficients. Letters in parentheses indicate the winning party.

TABLE 29

Gubernatorial Election Consistency
1952-1972

	<u>1954</u> <u>Gov.</u> <u>(D)</u>	<u>1956</u> <u>Gov.</u> <u>(D)</u>	<u>1958</u> <u>Gov.</u> <u>(D)</u>	<u>1960</u> <u>Gov.</u> <u>(R)</u>	<u>1962</u> <u>Gov.</u> <u>(R)</u>	<u>1966</u> <u>Gov.</u> <u>(D)</u>	<u>1970</u> <u>Gov.</u> <u>(D)</u>
1952 Governor (R)	.628	.852	.913	.892	.878	.819	.780
1954 Governor (D)		.798	.720	.599	.744	.751	.684
1956 Governor (D)			.962	.910	.876	.854	.919
1958 Governor (D)				.969	.943	.918	.923
1960 Governor (R)					.925	.864	.932
1962 Governor (R)						.938	.863
1966 Governor (D)							.846

Pearson Correlation Coefficients. Letters in parentheses indicate the winning party.

deviant one, with William Hathaway defeating Margaret Chase Smith. The others show some degree of consistency with Smith winning in 1954, 1960, and 1966. Edmund Muskie won in 1958, 1964, and 1970.

The deviant election for governor is Muskie's first victory in 1954, with Democrat Clinton Clauson's win in 1958 being the most representative. Governor Muskie's re-election in 1956 is more in keeping with the general Democratic voting pattern.

Taking the examination of elections one step further by comparing categories of elections, the data shows that there is more consistency between gubernatorial and presidential elections than between senatorial and presidential elections. There is even less consistency between gubernatorial and senatorial elections. The most consistent elections in terms of voting patterns are the 1958 senatorial and gubernatorial elections. The least consistent are the 1954 governor's election and the 1972 Senate race.

An interesting fact is seen by comparing the consistency of the vote pattern between elections held in the same year. In Maine, beginning in 1960, the elections would also be held on the same day.

Table 30 shows substantial relationships among elections held in the same year in terms of the pattern of Democratic vote. There is little difference between the pre-1960 period when the presidential and other elections were held on separate dates and the period from 1960 on when the elections were held on the same date.

TABLE 30

Consistency of Elections

<u>Year</u>	<u>Election</u>	<u>Correlation</u>
1952	President (R) - Senate (R)	.878
	President (R) - Governor (R)	.912
	Governor (R) - Senate (R)	.983
1954	Governor (D) - Senate (R)	.869
1956	President (R) - Governor (D)	.924
1958	Governor (D) - Senate (D)	.988
1960	President (R) - Senate (R)	.992
	President (R) - Governor (R)	.970
	Governor (R) - Senate (R)	.957
1964	President (D) - Senate (D)	.950
1966	Governor (D) - Senate (R)	.906
1970	Governor (D) - Senate (D)	.978
1972	President (R) - Senate (D)	.809

Pearson Correlation Coefficients. Letters in parentheses indicate the political party of the winning candidate.

The Findings

The results of the correlations of the socio-economic data with the data from the Democratic vote for each of the elections were somewhat predictable from the previous observations. What is interesting to note are the variations in values, both from election to election and over time. A pattern developed showing higher variable values for the presidential elections than either gubernatorial or senatorial races. Further there was a general lessening of value of the socio-economic variables from the beginning of the period to the end. This was particularly true of the ethnicity variables, suggesting that this part of the Democratic coalition is becoming less important. It was not true for all cases, however, and the presence of an ethnic name such as Violette or Cormier in a race for a U. S. Senate seat generally sharpened the ethnic impact.

A systematic analysis of the correlations requires a categorizing of the results, so the results are presented by category of election and by the underlying concept of the socio-economic variables.

The elections are grouped by office, and the socio-economic variables are grouped according to basic characteristics. Six variables constitute ethnicity; these are foreign born, 1960 and 1970; foreign or mixed parentage, 1960 and 1970; and foreign stock, 1960 and 1970. Foreign born, 1940, has been dropped because of its remoteness from the election data. A second category of variables consists of the urbanism-manufacturing classification. The income variables of median family

income and family income over \$10,000 for both 1960 and 1970 form the income category. The last category is that of religion, per cent Catholic, 1926 and 1936.

TABLE 31

Presidential Elections - Ethnicity
1952-1972

<u>Year</u>	<u>Foreign Born 1960</u>	<u>Foreign Born 1970</u>	<u>Foreign or Mixed 1960</u>	<u>Foreign or Mixed 1970</u>	<u>Foreign Stock 1960</u>	<u>Foreign Stock 1970</u>
1952	.911	.818	.927	.883	.931	.874
1956	.876	.804	.941	.895	.931	.881
1960	.891	.819	.955	.919	.946	.900
1964	.717	.579	.786	.714	.805	.719
1968	.847	.729	.904	.840	.896	.819
1972	.849	.775	.942	.889	.924	.869

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

From Table 31 three important factors can be seen. The first of these is the obvious importance to the cause of the Democratic Party of the ethnic vote.¹¹ With the exception of the 1964 presidential landslide of Lyndon Johnson, when the Democratic Party received substantial support from other than usual sources, the measures of ethnicity show extremely high correlations with the Democratic vote for President. The fact that the 1970 values are of a lower value than are the 1960 values, across the board, may indicate a diffusion and lessening of importance to the Democratic vote as support is picked up in other areas. The third point to be made is that specific elections do make a difference. John Kennedy's candidacy in 1960 shows the highest relationship with the ethnic vote as his status as a Catholic candidate would indicate. On the other hand, the success of Richard Nixon in 1972, of landslide proportions, reduced the Democratic margin to something resembling its traditional size, highlighting once again the importance of the ethnic vote.

The relationship of the vote for President and two other dimensions of the Democratic support, that of manufacturing and urbanism, can be seen in Table 32.

¹¹In general, we have equated the measures of ethnicity with the Franco-American population, but they are certainly not synonymous, even though they are the single largest ethnic group. An examination of the 1970 Census data shows that 68 per cent of the foreign born is from Canada, followed by the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, the USSR, and Ireland. Seventy per cent of the population of foreign or mixed parentage is from Canada, followed by the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, Ireland, and Sweden. Canada accounts for 80 per cent of the foreign stock, with the United Kingdom, Ireland, Italy, and Germany accounting for nearly 15 per cent more. U. S. Census, 1970, pp. 116, 121, 122, and 142.

TABLE 32

Presidential Elections
Urbanism-Manufacturing
1952-1972

<u>Year</u>	<u>% in Manuf. 1950</u>	<u>% in Manuf. 1960</u>	<u>% in Manuf. 1970</u>	<u>% Urban. 1960</u>	<u>% Urban. 1970</u>
1952	.676	.542	.484	.653	.674
1956	.611	.452	.387	.769	.775
1960	.592	.464	.403	.757	.770
1964	.746	.665	.598	.647	.611
1968	.678	.565	.493	.726	.728
1972	.537	.407	.337	.788	.867

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

Maine's economy has so developed that, unlike many other states, manufacturing is not substantially located in the urban areas. Of the five major manufacturing industries cited earlier, only leather and textiles are urban-oriented; the others, particularly lumber/wood, are widely scattered and more dependent on resource location. This fact would account for the relatively greater importance of the urbanism variable in the Democratic presidential vote.

A second general trend that is shown in the table is the

increase in importance of the urban variable in the Democratic picture. The generally higher values of 1970 over 1960 and the apparent increasing correlation values from the beginning to the end of the election period bear this out. The urban-based manufacturing, particularly textiles and leather goods, are dying industries in Maine, barring substantial changes in government policies which will offer them greater protection.

The importance of unionism was not evaluated in this paper, but Maine has a reputation as a "weak union" state, with little in the way of work stoppages and disputes. The textile and leather industries have generally been CIO organizations with the paper industry organized along craft lines. There has been, perhaps, somewhat greater militancy of workers in the textile and leather industries because of the general condition of the industry.¹² The unions are a factor, particularly in a presidential election such as 1964, when an essentially anti-union candidate is running. This could account for the increased support for the Democratic candidates in 1964 and 1968 in the manufacturing areas.

Table 33 shows the relationship between the income variables and the Democratic vote for President.

¹²The author in his previous research found the general philosophy of labor union leadership to be accommodating to the party in power, rather than extremely partisan. This was befitting its role in a basically one-party Republican state. More recently financial support and endorsements have gone to the Democratic candidates, but a low profile has been maintained. Whitmore B. Garland, "The Right-To-Work Movement in Maine" (M. A. Thesis, University of Maine, 1963), pp. 23-24, 108-109.

TABLE 33

Presidential Elections - Income
1952-1972

<u>Year</u>	<u>Median Family Income, 1960</u>	<u>Median Family Income, 1970</u>	<u>Family Income Over \$10,000 1960</u>	<u>Family Income Over \$10,000 1970</u>
1952	.520	.256	.449	.082
1956	.601	.402	.524	.229
1960	.595	.384	.512	.167
1964	.546	.267	.466	.083
1968	.644	.383	.579	.189
1972	.625	.458	.551	.273

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

In general, the income variables show a greater relationship with the Democratic vote for President than would be expected, particularly the 1960 levels. An examination of the total correlation matrix revealed moderate correlation values of median family income with measures of ethnicity and more substantial relationship with the urban and income variables. This would seem to indicate the situation that prevailed in Maine in the late 1950's and early 1960's with the urban-based industries in determining the income figure of the state. Since that time, there has been a movement away from the urban-based industry toward

lighter industry and more particularly toward the service industry.¹³ Therefore, the income variables are less connected to the Democratic vote now, with the higher income levels hardly showing any relationship at all.

With the closeness of the Catholic variable with the measures of ethnicity and urbanism, both variables being related to the Democratic vote, it is no surprise that there was a strong relationship between per cent Catholic and the Democratic support in presidential elections. This is shown in Table 34.

As was expected, there is a strong correlation between the location of the Democratic presidential vote and the places of Catholic concentrations. The presidential election of 1960 has the highest correlation, with the influence of President Kennedy's candidacy. The 1964 election shows the deviant pattern caused by the victory of President Johnson over Barry Goldwater. Higher values for 1972 indicates the return to the "hard-core" Democratic vote in a bad year for Democratic candidates.

Over all the correlations with the Democratic presidential vote and the socio-economic variables are what were expected. Further, there is a remarkable consistency, in spite of two atypical elections, in the support of Democratic candidates for the presidency.

¹³Maine's non-agricultural employment in 1975 showed that 26.9 per cent of workers were in manufacturing, 22.0 per cent in government, 20.8 per cent in trade, and 16.6 per cent in services. Maine Almanac, p. 222. In 1970 there were 31.6 per cent in manufacturing and in 1960, 33.2 per cent in manufacturing.

TABLE 34

Presidential Elections - Catholicism
1952-1972

<u>Year</u>	<u>% Catholic 1926</u>	<u>% Catholic 1936</u>
1952	.797	.769
1956	.834	.818
1960	.837	.866
1964	.705	.670
1968	.810	.777
1972	.863	.835

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

Examination of the findings for the Senate elections, however, reveals lower correlation values for the most part than those of the presidential elections. There is also a greater variation from election to election, indicating a greater importance of the individual candidates and specific election environment. Table 35 shows the relationship between the eight senatorial elections and the variables measuring ethnicity.

Comparing the levels of relationship between the Senate elections and the ethnicity variables with the levels of relationship found in the presidential elections, it is obvious that they are much lower

TABLE 35

Senatorial Elections - Ethnicity
1952-1972

<u>Year</u>	<u>Foreign Born 1960</u>	<u>Foreign Born 1970</u>	<u>Foreign or Mixed 1960</u>	<u>Foreign or Mixed 1970</u>	<u>Foreign Stock 1960</u>	<u>Foreign Stock 1970</u>
1952	.679	.562	.768	.681	.749	.656
1954	.866	.796	.901	.849	.899	.842
1958	.763	.657	.845	.773	.829	.750
1960	.890	.820	.948	.916	.940	.900
1964	.717	.579	.786	.714	.773	.687
1966	.896	.829	.927	.906	.927	.894
1970	.880	.796	.940	.891	.932	.875
1972	.757	.719	.777	.747	.779	.744

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

for the most part. With the exception of the 1960 and 1964 senatorial elections which were extremely close in pattern to the presidential elections of those years, other factors were involved.

Margaret Chase Smith ran in the elections of 1954, 1960, 1966, and 1972. In 1954 she ran against a very popular Democratic candidate in Professor Paul Fullam of Colby College in Waterville who made an

extremely strong showing.¹⁴ In two other cases Senator Smith ran against two ethnic-related candidates, Lucia Cormier of Rumford in 1960 and Elmer Violette in 1966. Both of these instances would have attracted the Franco-American vote; in fact, it would have been part of their appeal as candidates.

Senator Muskie's elections are those of 1958, 1964, and 1970 and amazingly show somewhat lower levels of support by ethnic groups than the other Senate elections. On the other hand, this fact may only be proof of Muskie's more general support than the other Democratic candidates.

The 1972 election, featuring Senator Smith's loss to William Hathaway is somewhat of a deviant election as is the 1964 election coupled with President Johnson's landslide. The 1972 presidential-senatorial elections have a low correlation of .809 as was previously noted.

As Table 36 shows, there are generally lower levels of correlation values for senatorial elections and per cent in manufacturing, but higher values for senatorial elections and per cent urban than were found for the corresponding values for presidential elections. There was not the amount of variation between elections as was seen earlier in the analysis of the ethnicity variables.

Except for the "deviant" 1964 and 1972 elections, the pattern of support is fairly consistent, with the manufacturing sector becoming less important for the Democrats, but with the urban population becoming

¹⁴Lockard, p. 102.

TABLE 36

Senatorial Elections
Urbanism-Manufacturing
1952-1972

<u>Year</u>	<u>% in Manuf. 1950</u>	<u>% in Manuf. 1960</u>	<u>% in Manuf. 1970</u>	<u>% Urban 1960</u>	<u>% Urban 1970</u>
1952	.722	.623	.552	.711	.730
1954	.606	.476	.450	.652	.680
1958	.705	.617	.567	.717	.720
1960	.573	.448	.385	.756	.748
1964	.713	.615	.529	.702	.659
1966	.518	.416	.354	.750	.728
1970	.564	.436	.391	.708	.751
1972	.383	.354	.330	.549	.570

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

more important as a source of Democratic votes. Certainly the shift in types of industry as well as the dispersion of industry are important in this trend, as was noted in the section on presidential elections. The factor of candidate impact appears to be less important.

Table 37 shows the relationship between the income variables and the senatorial elections for the period.

TABLE 37

Senatorial Elections - Income
1952-1972

<u>Year</u>	<u>Median Family Income, 1960</u>	<u>Median Family Income, 1970</u>	<u>Fam. Inc. Over \$10,000, 1960</u>	<u>Fam. Inc. Over \$10,000, 1970</u>
1952	.699	.483	.529	.219
1954	.484	.246	.427	.118
1958	.633	.415	.508	.179
1960	.566	.362	.584	.157
1964	.639	.426	.555	.230
1966	.507	.275	.459	.091
1970	.617	.350	.571	.155
1972	.373	.179	.310	.010

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

Again we find the somewhat spurious relationship between the Democratic vote and income levels that developed through the relationship of median family income, 1960, and family income over \$10,000, 1960, with manufacturing and urbanism. Both relationships tend to diminish substantially in 1970. As with the case of the presidential vote, the income variables did not show a continuing relationship with the senatorial vote in part because of the changing economic base.

The final relationship to be shown in the category of the senatorial elections are those with the religious variable Catholicism. The same general levels as with the presidential elections were found, as is indicated by Table 38.

TABLE 38

Senatorial Elections - Catholicism
1952-1972

<u>Year</u>	<u>% Catholic 1926</u>	<u>% Catholic 1936</u>
1952	.691	.651
1954	.832	.806
1958	.812	.793
1960	.897	.878
1964	.675	.641
1966	.874	.845
1970	.843	.816
1972	.835	.799

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

The Catholic variable for the senatorial races follows the same pattern as it does in the presidential elections with a somewhat lesser impact in corresponding 1952, 1964, and 1972 elections and a slightly greater impact in the 1960 year. The difference, however, is minor and the evidence is there to indicate substantial support for Democratic senatorial candidates from the Catholic areas.

As was noted earlier, governor's elections have, with few exceptions, followed the same pattern as those of the President and U. S. Senators, although Democratic victories have been more frequent. In terms of correlations with the socio-economic variables, the governor's elections fall somewhere between those of the President and the U. S. Senate. The measures of ethnicity are examined in Table 39.

There has been a consistent pattern in the relationship between the Democratic vote for governor and the ethnic vote, with a general increase over the period. The values are generally lower than those for presidential elections, but higher than the corresponding values for the senatorial contests. The biggest winning margin came with Muskie's 59.2 per cent of the vote in 1956. Edmund Muskie's first gubernatorial victory in 1954, which by some measures has been a deviant election in voting patterns, is more similar in pattern to the rest, with a slight drop-off in the foreign or mixed and foreign stock variables.

Table 40 shows the relationship of the governor's elections and the urbanism-manufacturing variables.

TABLE 39

Gubernatorial Elections - Ethnicity
1952-1972

<u>Year</u>	<u>Foreign Born 1960</u>	<u>Foreign Born 1970</u>	<u>Foreign or Mixed 1960</u>	<u>Foreign or Mixed 1970</u>	<u>Foreign Stock 1960</u>	<u>Foreign Stock 1970</u>
1952	.731	.608	.813	.727	.800	.704
1954	.748	.741	.727	.727	.740	.736
1956	.822	.736	.886	.840	.876	.820
1958	.811	.701	.881	.809	.869	.788
1960	.807	.700	.892	.835	.876	.808
1962	.825	.720	.862	.801	.860	.787
1966	.842	.727	.840	.780	.849	.773
1970	.849	.755	.933	.891	.917	.865

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

TABLE 40

Gubernatorial Elections
Urbanism, Manufacturing
1952-1972

<u>Year</u>	<u>% in Manuf. 1950</u>	<u>% in Manuf. 1960</u>	<u>% in Manuf. 1970</u>	<u>% Urban 1960</u>	<u>% Urban 1970</u>
1952	.687	.573	.492	.748	.775
1954	.307	.260	.283	.503	.562
1956	.592	.491	.457	.711	.745
1958	.714	.610	.538	.749	.737
1960	.671	.542	.440	.783	.761
1962	.665	.542	.446	.743	.697
1966	.688	.611	.545	.613	.585
1970	.545	.418	.358	.726	.758

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

The correlation values for urbanism and manufacturing and the Democratic vote for governor are comparable to those of the presidential elections but, again, higher than those of the senatorial contests. There has been a general increase in the importance of urbanism as a source of Democratic votes as opposed to manufacturing, brought on, no doubt, by the shift of manufacturing away from urban centers and the

general decline of manufacturing as an employer. The lower values of the correlations for the 1954 governor's election indicates that Edmund Muskie's successful election did not depend on the usual support factors of the Democratic Party.

Somewhat higher correlation values for the governor's elections and the income variables are noted in Table 41, but the same pattern in the dissolution of the relationship in 1970 is evident.

TABLE 41

Gubernatorial Elections - Income
1952-1972

Year	Median Family Income 1960	Median Family Income 1970	Fam. Inc. Over \$10,000 1960	Fam. Inc. Over \$10,000 1970
1952	.726	.485	.589	.245
1954	.209	-.034	.187	-.084
1956	.552	.321	.464	.142
1958	.633	.407	.513	.174
1960	.683	.492	.564	.251
1962	.531	.309	.455	.138
1966	.437	.167	.459	-.057
1970	.658	.430	.633	.237

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

Table 42 shows that the Catholic vote has generally increased in importance in governor's elections over the period. The relationship is not as strong in gubernatorial elections as it is in the presidential and senatorial elections, however. In the 1960 election in particular, there is a drop-off from the other contests. The Reed-Coffin election in 1960 and the Reed-Dolloff election in 1962 show a decline. The 1966 Curtis victory over Reed is more typical of the Democratic support in Catholic areas.

TABLE 42

Gubernatorial Elections - Catholicism
1952-1972

<u>Year</u>	<u>% Catholic 1926</u>	<u>% Catholic 1936</u>
1952	.729	.633
1954	.745	.724
1956	.827	.804
1958	.821	.794
1960	.807	.767
1962	.742	.719
1966	.874	.845
1970	.835	.833

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

The general findings have been that there is a close association between the Democratic vote in the statewide elections and measures of ethnicity and Catholicism. In part, these variables are measuring the same vote. There is a fairly high correlation between the Democratic vote and urbanism, with a lesser and diminishing relationship with manufacturing. This may be due, in part, to the change in economic base of the state resulting in the dispersal of the manufacturing industry and a smaller role in employment. The relationship with the Democratic vote and income was inconsistent. Median family income and family income over \$10,000 was tied somewhat in the 50's and 60's to the ethnicity variables, urbanism and manufacturing. That relationship dissipated by the 1970's; consequently, the correlation values show little relationship between the Democratic vote and income in 1970.

The Change Variables

The final steps in the analysis involved an attempt to identify the areas of change in the Democratic vote for the entire 1952 to 1972 period. The change variables of the elections, noted in Chapter III, were correlated with the socio-economic and election variables discussed in Chapter IV. The results of the correlations of the change variables are shown in Table 43.

A general statement about where the change in the Democratic vote is occurring can be made from the table. With the exception of

TABLE 43

Change Variable Correlations

	<u>% Chg. All Elections</u>	<u>% Chg. Pres. Elections</u>	<u>% Chg. Gov. Elections</u>	<u>% Chg. Sen. Elections</u>
Average Dem. Vote	-.293	-.706	.377	-.216
% Chg. All Elections		.594	.554	.907
% Chg. Pres. Elections			-.039	.440
% Chg. Gov. Elections				.394

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

the change in the governor's elections, the change is not happening where the normal Democratic vote occurs. It is not a case of the Democratic areas becoming more Democratic. As expected, there is a substantial relationship among all the change variables and per cent change in all elections for that variable is something of a composite of the presidential, governor's, and senatorial per cent change variable. The per cent change in senatorial elections is most like the per cent change in all elections. There is a similarity between the change in presidential elections and the Senate elections, but a negative, if any, relationship between the change in presidential elections and that of the governor's elections. Finally, there is a low correlation of .394 between the change in

governor's elections and the change in senatorial elections.

The exception is the per cent change in gubernatorial elections. Although the change is generally a third of the other electoral changes, it has occurred in the areas of Democratic strength. This is particularly the case with the ethnic voter, where the correlations range from a high of .435 to a low of .339. Per cent change in gubernatorial elections also show correlations of .310 and .332 with per cent urban and per cent Catholic. All of these point to the fact that the increase in Democratic vote for the governor has come from traditionally Democratic areas.

The change in presidential elections, and to some degree the change in senatorial elections, is not coming from the traditional Democratic areas. There are strong negative correlations of the value of .730 and over with the per cent change in presidential vote and the measures of ethnicity. Moderate negative values of .586 and .566 with the per cent Catholic variables, and negative values in the range of .339 to .419 with the manufacturing and urbanism variables.

Table 44 shows the positive correlations with the change in the presidential vote.

The increase in the presidential vote is in the counties having the highest number of median school years completed. The state figure is 10.2 for 1950 and 12.1 for 1970, but the upper range in 1970 of 12.2 to 12.4 indicates at least some education beyond high school. This would normally be a Republican oriented group.

The second element of change in the presidential vote is where

TABLE 44

Per Cent Change in Presidential Elections

Median Age, 1950	.241
Median School Years Completed, 1960	.731
Median School Years Completed, 1970	.515
Change in Foreign Stock	.544

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

there has been little change in foreign stock. That change in foreign stock was approximately a minus 4 per cent for the decade 1960 to 1970, with the largest change coming in the traditionally heavy foreign stock counties such as Androscoggin and York. The least change occurred in counties with little foreign stock to begin with.

Both elements together indicate that the greatest change in the presidential vote is occurring in the four mid-coastal counties of Lincoln, Knox, Waldo, and Hancock. Cumberland, Penobscot, and Franklin Counties also show substantial change. These are the counties with the highest median school years completed, and, with the exception of Cumberland and Penobscot which have had moderate losses in foreign stock, the counties with the smallest loss of foreign stock for the period.

The per cent change in all elections variable and the per cent change in the senatorial elections variable follow the presidential change variable for the most part. They show a very low negative value, shifting to positive in some cases, for the correlation with the ethnicity variable, indicating perhaps a tendency to follow the change in Democratic vote for the governor. Both show a low .200 to .223 correlation with per cent white collar. Both are more nebulous in the sources of their change.

To summarize the basic findings concerning the electoral change variables, there is no single source or direction of change. Democratic presidential candidates are finding increased support among the more educated and with the least change in foreign stock; a direction that indicates support from formally Republican areas. Democratic candidates for governor are benefitting from increased support of the traditional Democratic areas; a case of Democratic areas becoming more Democratic. The candidates for Senator from the Democratic Party, for the most part Edmund Muskie during this period, got the best of both possible worlds.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

... the processes of political change in Vermont have been relatively free of socioeconomic contamination. Neither in the origin of Republican domination nor in the breakthrough of the Democrats were significant alterations in the character of Vermont society at play. In the latter case, especially, the state was changing in certain respects (changes that did not, significantly, include increasing urbanization), but these changes did not seem causally related to the new Democratic successes. This lack of causal relationship strikes a blow at the argument that socioeconomic forces are root causes of political phenomena.

Frank M. Bryan,
Yankee Politics in Rural Vermont¹

The quotation from Professor Bryan's interesting and engaging book illustrates, in part, the difficulty in coming to grips with the causes of political change. Certainly a great deal of the writing on

¹Frank M. Bryan, Yankee Politics in Rural Vermont (Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 1974), p. 124.

American political parties at the national as well as the state and local level has been predicated on the concept of the importance of socio-economic variables as at least partial determinants of the individual's vote. Earlier voting studies emphasized a form of social determinism, whereas later studies pointed out the importance of political attitudes and identifications.² It is common acceptance in our political discussions to indicate that certain groups vote for the Democratic Party and others vote for the Republican Party. Professor Bryan does not mean to say, however, that these known attachments do not have validity. Rather, that he found little major change in the demography of his state of Vermont. There was change within the groups that had made up the population for many years.³ He has added dimension to the concept of socio-economic change that is hard to measure.

Another difficulty arises over the determination of the scope of the study of change. In this we refer to the geographical scope rather than the time limit. Each state may be viewed as a regional entity as well as a part of the national complex.

²The classics such as Paul Lazarsfeld et al., The People's Choice (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944); and Bernard R. Berelson et al., Voting (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954) emphasized the importance of socio-economic factors in voting. The other voting study classics such as Angus Campbell et al., The Voter Decides (Evanston: Row Peterson and Co., 1954); Angus Campbell et al., The American Voter (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960); and Angus Campbell et al., Elections and the Political Order (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966) strongly emphasized the role of the psychology of the voter -- his attitudes and identifications. A thorough update and revision of many of the findings of the earlier studies can be found in Norman H. Nie, Sidney Verba, and John R. Petrocik, The Changing American Voter (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976).

³Bryan, pp. 241-251.

The northeast, of which Maine is a part, has long been treated on a regional basis; but more recently the region has been reduced in size to the six-state New England region. For political analysis, New England is further divided between the northern tier -- Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont -- and the southern tier of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.⁴ The northern states have been one-party Republican states for more than half of this century, while the southern New England states became competitive two-party states at a substantially earlier date.

Other parts of the literature have treated Maine on a national basis. That is, the changes that Maine has gone through have been compared to other states across the nation, both in terms of timing and in terms of impact and cause.⁵ Louis H. Bean, although acknowledging Maine's close relationship to New Hampshire and Vermont in voting pattern, found that from 1948 to 1956 the Maine vote for the Democratic Party in presidential elections paralleled that of the nation.⁶

⁴Duane Lockard talks about the two New Englands in his New England State Politics (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1968), pp. 3-7. Other writers have accepted the division as legitimate and have continued the analysis of the differences between the two parts of New England. See David R. Mayhew, Two-Party Competition in the New England States (Amherst Bureau of Government Research, 1967).

⁵Examples of this approach are James L. Sundquist, Dynamics of the Party System: Alignment and Realignment of Political Parties in the United States (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1973) and Everett Carll Ladd, American Political Parties: Social Change and Political Response (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1970).

⁶Louis H. Bean, How America Votes in Presidential Elections (Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1968), pp. 86, 121.

Coleman B. Ransone, Jr., in his study of the office of governor, found the vote for governor in the state of Maine was similar to that of South Dakota and Iowa for the period 1930 to 1950.⁷ Many authors agree with the assessment of American politics put forth by E. E. Schattschneider. His assessment was that the 1932 election for President began a process of nationalization of politics which has tended to minimize the impact of regional and sectional voting patterns.⁸

Still a third difficulty arises from the continuing controversy over the best measure of inter-party competition. There is disagreement over what political office or offices or combination thereof provides the most accurate gauge of the strength of the two-party system in each state. Numerous studies have been based on the presidential vote; but Paul T. David, for one, feels that the vote for President is the least reliable of the statewide elections as a measure of party strength because it varies widely from the other elections.⁹ He feels that his Composite B, a measure including the vote for governor, Senator, and Representative, is the best measure of general party strength.¹⁰ Other authors have used a combination of measures which have included the vote

⁷Coleman B. Ransone, Jr., The Office of Governor in the United States (University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1956), p. 51.

⁸E. E. Schattschneider, The Semisovereign People (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), pp. 86-96.

⁹Paul T. David, Party Strength in the United States, 1872-1970 (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1972), p. 17.

¹⁰Ibid.

for selected statewide offices, party control of state legislatures, and number of electoral contests won.¹¹

It is not within the scope of this work to analyze fully the difficulties raised here, but merely to suggest the variety of concerns related to the understanding of political change. All of these factors and others have an impact on any conclusions that an observer may reasonably infer.

Maine's Status as a Two-Party State

The notion that Maine has become a competitive two-party state in most respects is not unique to the present research. Numerous observers have noted Maine's changing political makeup. The actual placing of Maine in a category apparently has depended upon the time span and measure of competitiveness used. Both John Fenton and Austin Ranney put Maine in the two-party category.¹² Fenton's time span is 1946-1958,

¹¹For example, John H. Fenton used the vote for governor and the percentage of Republican and Democratic seats in the two houses of the state legislatures to compile his index of two-party competition in People and Parties in Politics (Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Company, 1966), pp. 33-34. Austin Ranney used the Democratic vote for governor, the Democratic seats in the Senate and House of Representatives for each state, and the percentage of all terms for governor, Senate and House held by the Democrats. Austin Ranney, "Parties in State Politics," in Herbert Jacobs, Kenneth N. Vines, Politics in the American States: A Comparative Analysis, 2nd edition (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971), p. 86.

¹²Fenton, p. 34; Ranney, 1971, p. 27.

while Ranney's is 1956-1970. Earlier, Ranney, using the time span of 1946-1963, placed Maine in the modified one-party Republican classification.¹³

Richard E. Dawson, using the same time frame as the earlier Ranney study, gave Maine a medium competitive classification on a score of 71.3 per cent, with 60 per cent or less being highly competitive.¹⁴ Dawson did find, however, that by taking simply the vote for governor in Maine, northern New England and a number of north central states such as the Dakotas, Nebraska, and Kansas, he could establish a more competitive political relationship.¹⁵

Other authors, using an earlier or a longer time frame, place Maine in the Republican classification or simply one-party. Paul David found Maine to be predominantly Republican for the period 1932-1970.¹⁶ Coleman B. Ransone, Jr., classified Maine as a normally Republican state,¹⁷ while Thomas R. Dye considered Maine a modified one-party state.¹⁸

Richard I. Hofferbert assigned Maine a score of 35 on his

¹³Ranney, 1965, p. 65.

¹⁴Richard E. Dawson, "Social Development, Party Competition and Policy," in William Nesbet Chambers, Walter Dean Burnham, The American Party Systems, Stages of Political Development (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 216, 224. Dawson used the composite percentages of popular support for governor, House, and Senate.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 226.

¹⁶David, p. 43.

¹⁷Ransone, p. 40.

¹⁸Thomas R. Dye, Politics in States and Communities, 2nd edition (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), p. 105.

inter-party competitiveness index without specifying what such a score meant in terms of one-party or two-party status.¹⁹

When we consider the earlier findings of this work, we find that the Democratic Party has enjoyed a success rate of 52.4 per cent in the electoral contests for governor, U. S. Senator, and U. S. House of Representatives from 1952 to 1972. This does not include victories for the Democratic Party in the 1964 and 1968 presidential races.

The following table (Table 45) indicates the existence of the two-party status of Maine as calculated by two of the inter-party competition indexes.

TABLE 45

Maine's Classification as a Two-Party State

<u>Original</u>		<u>New</u>
Ranney (1956-70)	.3820	.3828 (1954-74)
Fenton (1946-58)	65	87 (1954-74)

Source²⁰

¹⁹Richard I. Hofferbert, "Classification of American State Party Systems," in Donald P. Sprenkel, Comparative State Politics, A Reader (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971), p. 138.

²⁰Both authors indicate their method of calculation. See Ranney, 1971, p. 86; Fenton, p. 33.

There is little change in the Ranney Inter-Party Competition Index, primarily because both calculations are roughly of the same time span. The longer period of the new calculation contained elements that balanced each other off. A higher per cent of the vote for governor in 1954 and Democratic control of the state legislature in 1974 was balanced by firm Republican control of the legislature in 1954 and a disastrous showing by both major parties in the governor's race in 1974 which saw the Independent, James Longley, outpolling both the Democrats and Republicans. The index of .3828 keeps Maine in its same relative position as a weaker two-party state.

The dates indicate very little overlap in the two figures for the Fenton Two-Party Competition Score. The earlier Fenton score would not have included the Democratic victories in gubernatorial races in 1966 and 1970 and the near miss in 1962. On the legislative scene the new calculation of the Fenton index includes control of the legislature by the Democrats in 1964, Democratic control of the Maine House of Representatives in 1974, and increased Democratic members in both houses of the state legislature from 1968 on.

The newer figure of 87 puts Maine near the middle of Fenton's strong two-party competition score of 80 - 100.²¹

The evidence is fairly strong that Maine can no longer be considered one-party Republican or a modified one-party Republican state as a number of the earlier observers have claimed. Maine meets all of the criteria that Austin Ranney and Willmoore Kendall specified for two-

²¹Fenton, p. 35.

party states.²² There are two parties which share the vote and public office between them; the winning party has gained a majority of the votes and offices; and the two dominant parties have alternated in winning office.

The success of a third-party, or rather a no-party candidate, in the 1974 governor's election does not yet indicate any sort of a breakdown of the two-party system. If the Independent candidate for governor should win again in the current campaign and election, it would be necessary to rethink the assessment of Maine as a two-party state. Third parties have been a factor in the past, leading to a "fusion" type of government, particularly in 1881 with the Greenback Movement and with the Progressives in 1914.

Maine's Politics -- Nationalized or Regionalized?

James Sundquist, in Dynamics of the Party System, places Maine's political changes in the Twentieth Century into a national context. He identifies Maine as one of a tier of sixteen northern states stretching west to California that underwent a two-stage realignment process. In essence, the process for the sixteen involved a Democratic gain during the New Deal, a subsequent loss followed by a second-stage peak and gain.²³ The corresponding periods for Maine were as follows:

²²Austin Ranney, Willmoore Kendall, "The American Party Systems," American Political Science Review 48 (1954), 481.

²³Sundquist, p. 234.

the pre-New Deal trough was 1924-30; the New Deal peak was during 1932-38; the post-New Deal trough occurred in 1943-48; the period of principal second-stage gain was 1954-58 with the second-stage peak occurring during 1958-64.²⁴

Sundquist feels that the two-stage realignment process with a considerable period of time in between was caused primarily by the unattractiveness of the state and local Democratic Parties. The leadership was too old, conservative, and committed to patronage to attract the Roosevelt supporters.²⁵ In many cases the party was too Catholic to appeal to the Protestant voters or too urban to appeal to the rural or small town voter.²⁶

The need to bring the change toward the Democratic Party was a new leadership component, described by Sundquist as the "programmatic liberal Democrat."²⁷ In Maine, the change came with the election of Edmund S. Muskie as governor and continued during his two terms.²⁸ Basically, Sundquist believes that the new leadership brought a new

²⁴Ibid., pp. 234-235. For the most part, Maine is bracketed with other New England states such as Vermont, Connecticut, and Massachusetts; the midwestern states of Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, and the Pacific coast states of California and Oregon. Only in Maine's post-New Deal trough period of 1942-48 does it stand alone. Sundquist uses Paul David's Composite B index which excludes the presidential vote.

²⁵Ibid., p. 239.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Ibid., p. 243.

image to the party, enabling a recruitment of the young and the amateurs, the group that Neal Pierce noted as being the campus liberal, the intellectual, and the middle-class Protestant.²⁹ Indeed, a number of observers have termed the rise of the Democratic Party in Maine as the "Muskie Phenomenon" or the "Muskie Revolution."³⁰

The view of Maine's change as a part of a nationwide phenomenon is interesting, but the scenario is almost too neat. Ten of Sundquist's sixteen states began their second-stage gain in 1954; eight have identical periods of 1954 to 1958 as the entire period of second-stage gain.³¹ Certainly the problems experienced by the Republican Party in the state through the controversial administration of Governor Burton Cross provided some of the momentum for the Democratic victory.

Further, if voter registrations are examined rather than the vote totals, the period of steady growth in Democratic registrations comes after the 1960 elections.³² Figure 6 shows that there was a general increase in both the Democratic vote as measured by Composite B and in the Democratic voter registrations in 1960. Sundquist's figures, being averages of a span of four biennial elections, are influenced by Senator Muskie's election in 1958 and President Johnson's landslide victory in 1964. The graph in Figure 6 indicates a more gradual growth

²⁹Pierce, p. 380.

³⁰George Goodwin, Jr. and Victoria Schuck, eds., Party Politics in the New England States (Durham: The New England Center for Continuing Education (1968), p. 45.

³¹Sundquist, p. 234.

³²See Table 23.

Source:
Downeast Politics
Party Strength in the United States




FIGURE 6
COMPARISON OF COMPOSITE B
Democratic Vote and Democratic
Voter Registrations 1954-1974

in the Democratic Party than indicated by the data in Sundquist's table.³³ The data does not refute Sundquist's explanation, but merely questions the completeness and suddenness of the changes he discusses.

Further, it can be said that the "peak" of 1958-1964 may simply be a product of the cut-off point. Using Paul David's figures³⁴ and averaging over the period of four successive elections as Sundquist does, we arrive at Democratic strength of 51.4 per cent for the 1958-1964 period. Extending the Composite B index through to 1972 and averaging the election years 1966 to 1972, we get the value of 52.4 per cent. As can be seen in Figure 6, there are no two elections that show successive losses in the Democratic vote. Further extension of the Composite B index through 1974 shows a value of 45.2, revealing a decreasing value for the Democratic Party for successive elections.

At this point, there is a rapid increase in the category of Independents, both at the state level and the national level. The Independents showed a healthy gain of over 45,000 voters, while the Democratic gains were less than half that total.³⁵ The figures show that the Independents did not maintain that level, either in numbers or per cent of the electorate in the next election year.

None of this refutes the basic theory that Sundquist has put forth. It merely places some doubt as to timing and duration of the change.

³³Sundquist, p. 234.

³⁴David, pp. 151-158.

³⁵Table 24, p. 105.

A major advocate of the regional component in the development of American political parties and their realignments is Walter Dean Burnham.³⁶ As he clearly states:³⁷

At least as significant an historical contribution to American political heterogeneity as ethnic and racial pluralism is the existence of well-marked and often antagonistic regionalism. It can be argued that the phenomenon of sectionalism dominated national electoral and policy coalition-formation from the 1850's through the 1930's; the results of the 1964 and 1968 elections clearly reveal its enduring significance down to the present.

This is clearly in opposition to the observations of many that the election of 1932 and the formation of the New Deal coalition destroyed the sectional or regional basis of American politics and substituted in its place the cross currents of class-based antagonisms.

Burnham makes a convincing case for the continued existence of regionalism; a regionalism based in the first instance on culture, but steadily becoming substantially linked to economic growth and development.³⁸ By adding to the traditional regions based on geography,

³⁶Professor Burnham has written numerous books and articles on American political parties. His key work is Critical Elections and the Mainsprings of American Politics (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1970). Much of the discussion here is from his "The United States: The Politics of Heterogeneity," in Richard Rose, ed., Electoral Behavior: A Comparative Handbook (New York: The Free Press, 1974), pp. 653-725.

³⁷Rose, p. 656.

³⁸Ibid., p. 657.

and therefore in part on economics, two distinct economic regions entitled Manufacturing I and Manufacturing II, Burnham, through the analysis of the presidential vote, develops a series of critical realignments in American politics from 1876-1968, based on regional economic changes.³⁹

By comparing the mean major-party pluralities for each of the regions, Burnham traces the competitiveness of the two-party system through time. He finds the 1876-1892 period to be highly competitive, with a shift to Republican dominated non-competitiveness from 1896-1928. The 1932-1948 period is the reversal of the movement from period 1 to period 2, with a thoroughly non-competitive, Democratic-dominated political scene.

The 1952-1968 period has seen a return to a competitive two-party system.⁴⁰ Perhaps as significant in Burnham's finding that the regional standard durations indicate an existence of regional differences greater than those of 1896.⁴¹

More importantly, the Manufacturing II region, of which Maine is a part, has nearly come full cycle through the four realignments.

³⁹Ibid., pp. 671-673. Manufacturing I includes states in which 40 per cent and over of the labor force was in manufacturing in 1920. These were the New England states of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, with the states of Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio and Pennsylvania. Manufacturing II was composed of states with 30-39.9 per cent of its labor force in manufacturing. These states were Maine, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, New York, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin. In essence, these two regions replace the New England, Middle Atlantic, and East North Central regions. Burnham's other regions were West North Central, Mountain, Pacific, Border, and South.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 673.

It has gone from a value of 1.8 R (based on mean major party pluralities) in 1876-1892, through modified one-party Republican to leaning Democratic to competitive with a value of 0.9 R in 1952-1968.⁴² These changes occurred as the region found its share of the country's population engaged in manufacturing and agriculture decreasing, but its own manufacturing labor force component staying remarkably the same while its agricultural labor force fell by some 27 per cent.⁴³

Burnham views the election of 1964 as a possible realigning election, with the gains of the Republicans in the South and the gains of the Democrats in the Northeast proving remarkably enduring. It may mean that "normal" elections may be a time in returning.⁴⁴

A more conventional view of regionalism is set forth by David R. Mayhew in his Two-Party Competition in the New England States.⁴⁵ Mayhew analyzes the trend of the Democratic vote for governor for the period of 1900 to 1964 and finds all of the New England states are becoming more Democratic and therefore more competitive.⁴⁶ The Democratic percentage gain in the gubernatorial vote for Maine is 4.0, the smallest gain for any of the New England states, although Vermont and Maine are virtually tied in the 1964 value. This can be compared to the rate

⁴²Ibid., p. 672.

⁴³Ibid., p. 671.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 693.

⁴⁵David R. Mayhew, Two-Party Competition in the New England States (Amherst: Bureau of Government Research, 1967).

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 6.

of change for gubernatorial elections for the 1952-1972 election period of 6.44 per cent found as a part of this research.⁴⁷

Mayhew's thesis is that state politics are tending to lose their regional character and are being brought more into line with national presidential politics. To show this, he calculates an Index of Isolation derived from the mean deviation of presidential percentages of the vote for each state from the national percentages for the elections from 1836 to 1964.⁴⁸

Arranging the states by value, with the larger values suggesting greater isolation and, therefore, less tendency to be competitive, Mayhew shows that the states with the smallest indexes of isolation are the populous, more heterogeneous states.⁴⁹ Maine shows an average deviation of 8.1, placing it in Class III as opposed to the most competitive Class I. The Class IV states are those of the South with the exception of Vermont. Four of the New England states have a high isolation rating,⁵⁰ with only Connecticut having a low index of isolation.

When Mayhew's index of isolation is figured for Maine for the years 1952-1972, the value is 9.15, indicating even greater isolation than in the earlier figures. Given the narrow data base, the new figure is at best an approximation of isolation. The corollary that less isolation means more of a trend toward competitive two-parties does not seem

⁴⁷Table 21, p. 98.

⁴⁸Mayhew, p. 13.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 14.

⁵⁰Ibid.

to hold. Further, it casts a doubt on the idea that Maine's move toward a two-party system is simply the impact of national politics catching up with Maine after its long period of relative isolation.

The Roles of the Independent Voter

Earlier it was suggested that the Independent voter in Maine had played a substantial role in the movement toward a two-party system.⁵¹ The Independent category in some instances has supplemented the Democratic votes and in others has acted as a "transfer station" in the shift of Republicans to the Democratic side of the two-party system. Certainly as long as neither major party has the quantity of votes to win elections on its own, which has been the case since 1960 in Maine, then the Independents will be a controlling factor in Maine's elections.

Nationally, the Independents are noted for shifting back and forth between the major parties, although the shifts may be greater in presidential elections than in congressional elections.⁵² It is agreed that for the nation as a whole the Independents are forming a much larger part of the electorate, but there is no agreement on the exact meaning. Burnham uses the increase in the number of Independents and the general

⁵¹See pp. 103-109.

⁵²William H. Flanigan and Nancy H. Zingale, Political Behavior of the American Electorate, 3rd edition (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975), pp. 59-60.

decrease in voter turnout as indicators of the demise of political parties as we now know them.⁵³ Other observers have noted that since 1964 nearly half of the younger voters have entered the Independent ranks, therefore the increase in the number of Independents can be accounted for by the enfranchisement of the younger voters.⁵⁴ The argument is that as these younger voters age they will be inclined to develop a greater sense of partisanship.

Figure 7 compares the portion of the electorate that is Independent in the state to that for the nation. Interestingly enough, the Independents in Maine were a larger portion than those nationally until 1964. Since that time there has not been the sharp increase in the Independents that has been experienced nationally. In 1974 there was nearly a 10 per cent difference in the two electorates.

The victory of the self-professed Independent, James Longley, in the governor's election in 1974, was not an indication of Maine's following the national trend. Longley won 40.6 per cent of the vote, followed by the Democratic candidate's 36.3 per cent, and the Republican's 23.1 per cent.⁵⁵ Enrollment figures in 1974 showed the Independents with 30.4 per cent of the electorate, the Democrats 33.6 per cent, and the Republicans 36.1 per cent. Obviously the Longley candidacy

⁵³Rose, pp. 697-699; 714-715.

⁵⁴Nie et al., pp. 59-61. The authors do not accept the idea in total, but analyze its possible impact as a source of the decline in partisanship.

⁵⁵Scammon, Vol. 11, p. 148.

Source
 The Changing American Vote
 Downeast Politics
 Political Behavior of the American Electorate




FIGURE 7
 COMPARISON OF INDEPENDENT VOTERS
 State and Nation 1954-1974

siphoned off votes from both parties.

Howard L. Reiter found that Longley's victory was due to a combination of factors.⁵⁶ The friends and neighbors effect of Longley's life-long residence as a Democrat in Lewiston of Androscoggin County and his Catholic religion were cited as major factors. He gained more than 13,000 of his 15,331 statewide vote plurality from his home county.⁵⁷ He gained support from the defeated Democratic primary candidate, Joseph Brennan. He also ran well in a number of Republican areas, particularly with Republicans of high income and non-Canadian origins.⁵⁸ Reiter also found support for Longley among the "ticket-splitters," which, in essence, were the Independents.

This brief survey of the Longley election was merely to show that his victory was not so much a part of the national trend toward the Independent vote as it was a protest vote combined with the friends and neighbors vote. In some ways it was simply a personal victory for James Longley.

More important than the actual percentages of the Independents in the electorate is the fact that there are overall increases and that the largest increases are coming in heavily Republican areas such as Knox, Lincoln, Waldo, and Hancock Counties. At least part of the increased Democratic support is coming from these counties in presidential

⁵⁶Howard L. Reiter, "Who Voted for Longley? Maine Elects an Independent Governor," Paper presented at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Political Science Association, New Brunswick, New Jersey, November 13-15, 1975, pp. 16-17.

⁵⁷Scammon, Vol. 11, p. 148.

⁵⁸Reiter, p. 16.

elections.

In general, for the period 1952-1972 nationwide, the Independents have increased their numbers among the high school educated Catholics and Protestants, among the college educated Protestants and the Jewish voters. There are Independent losses in grade school Catholics and college and grade school educated Protestants. The Democrats and Republicans have lost in the areas that the Independents have gained.⁵⁹

The relationship between the Independent vote and the increase in the Democratic vote in Maine is best seen through the change in the Democratic vote for President. The Independent vote in the mid-coastal counties can be seen through the correlation of .731 and .515 between Median School Years Completed in 1950 and 1970 and the change in Democratic vote in presidential elections.⁶⁰ The figures show that the change in Democratic vote for President is coming from the counties with higher numbers of Median School Years Completed. Together with Cumberland and Penobscot, these counties are Lincoln, Hancock, Knox, Waldo, and Sagadahoc.

The Socio-Economic Variables

Edmund S. Muskie's election as governor in 1954 was the breakthrough election for the Democratic Party in Maine. Tradition has it

⁵⁹Flanigan, 3rd edition, p. 72.

⁶⁰See pp. 143-144.

that the victory was a result of the Republicans being "ripe" for defeat as well as the result of a masterly planned campaign which brought together the two wings of the Democratic Party, the immigrant-ethnic stock represented by Muskie and the Yankee Protestant "Jacksonian" Democrats in Frank M. Coffin, campaign manager and state chairman.⁶¹ The indefatigable campaign, crisscrossing the state, but with judicious and capable use of television for the first time, brought the Democrats victory in the gubernatorial race for the first time since the Louis Brann victories in the early 30's. Muskie's victory was not accompanied by a massive turnout of voters normally associated with a party realignment.⁶²

The Muskie victory had less association with the ethnic vote, urbanism and manufacturing than most of the Democratic elections for governor have since. It had one of the lower correlations with the Catholic vote. The win did not correlate strongly with other gubernatorial elections of the period. The 1954 victory was, in most aspects, an atypical Democratic election. More than any other election during the period, it was decided by the ticket-splitter. Edmund Muskie received 135,673 votes, while Margaret Chase Smith received 144,530 votes, her lowest total as a candidate for the Senate.⁶³ Muskie "Republicans"

⁶¹John C. Donovan, Congressional Campaign: Maine Elects a Democrat (New Jersey: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960), pp. 3-4.

⁶²See pp. 82-83. Burnham, Critical Elections, pp. 6-10. Burnham wrote that critical realignments are characterized by large blocs of partisan voters shifting allegiance and highly intense elections with abnormally large voter turnout. There is generally an idealogical polarization of the electorate.

⁶³Maine Almanac, pp. 317, 326.

figured strongly in his victory.

Vermont's breakthrough for the Democrats in the 1950's has found other areas of support, primarily the urban counties with white collar employees in the work force. It was the upper middle classes of the larger towns that supported the change.⁶⁴ There was no correlation with white collar workers and Muskie's election in 1954.

Once the Democratic trend had been established, the support for Democratic candidates for all statewide offices tended to be traditional. The state's ethnic populations, the Catholic vote, the labor force in manufacturing, and the urban dwellers all have moderate to high correlations with the Democratic vote with few exceptions.⁶⁵

Table 46 shows the extent to which the Democratic vote is dependent on these socio-economic characteristics.

The data shows that 82 per cent of the variance in the average Democratic vote by county can be explained by the three socio-economic characteristics which are traditionally connected with the Democratic Party.⁶⁶

⁶⁴Bryan, p. 103.

⁶⁵In some respects the presidential election of 1964 was a "deviant" election in terms of support for the Democratic candidate. All of the ethnic measures as well as the Catholic vote correlations were lower, as was urban; while manufacturing showed a higher correlation. Other than in voter registrations, however, the 1964 presidential election with its 68.8 per cent of the vote cast for President Johnson did not seem to alter the vote pattern.

⁶⁶Certainly a warning here should be noted that is long overdue in this work. Correlations, be they simple, partial, or multiple, do not suggest a cause and effect relationship. A substantial weakness is revealed when the attempt is made to go from correlations of aggregate data to statements of individual behavior. All we are able to do is suggest that the individuals described as belonging to the categories established by the variables act as the data indicates.

TABLE 46

Multiple Correlations For the Average Democratic Vote
1952-1972

<u>Variable</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>R²</u>
Foreign Stock	.864	.746
Urban	.898	.807
Catholic	.906	.820

The traditional Democratic demographic support does not explain the changes in Democratic support that has occurred from 1952 to 1972. The socio-economic variables of manufacturing, foreign stock, and urbanism yield only a multiple correlation of .446 and an explained variance of about 20 per cent in the change in all elections variable.

An attempt to explain the rate of change in governor's elections through change in foreign stock, foreign stock and urbanism yielded a multiple correlation of .453 and an explained variance of about 21 per cent. The change in foreign stock was negatively correlated with the change in the governor's vote.

Multiple correlations of the three variables that through simple correlations were of medium correlation value with the change in presidential elections, those of change in foreign stock, median age and median school years completed yielded a multiple correlation of .678 and an explanation of variance of about 46 per cent. Median age had only

limited explanatory power.

The multiple correlation analysis simply reinforced the findings of the simple correlation analysis. The findings have been as follows:

1) Democratic support in Maine has come from the traditionally Democratic sources, both from the regional and national perspective.

2) Extremely popular Democratic politicians, such as Edmund Muskie, do not, as a rule, simply bring out more Democrats from the Democratic areas. Their support becomes more widespread. This is also true of popular Republican politicians such as Margaret Chase Smith.

3) The Independent voter has played a major role in the Democrats success in recent years, first as an alternative to registering as a Democrat, and later as a means of transferring Republican support to the Democrats.

4) The increase in the Democratic support for presidential and senatorial candidates has been coming from traditional Republican places of strength.

5) The increase in the Democratic support for gubernatorial candidates is coming from the traditional Democratic areas. This is a case of Democratic areas becoming more Democratic.

Certainly the different voter support pattern for the three types of statewide elections is the most intriguing discovery of the study. Most of the literature suggests a regular and constant change as a state moves from one competitive status to another. The Maine political

scene has indicated that the true picture may be more in the nature of a conflicting and volatile change pattern. As Maine became more Democratic, the rates of change for each of the three types of elections varied substantially. This was equally true of the sources of the increased Democratic support. Personalities made a difference as probably did the issues. Maine political tradition has indicated that such is the case.

In a more general sense, the author has found that in the past two decades or so Maine has become a competitive two-party state by most standards. Earlier movements toward a more competitive status in this century were primarily the result of heated issues or the emergence of a popular Democratic candidate. The Democratic victories of the 1930's were probably not the New Deal realignment, for Franklin Roosevelt was not a successful candidate in Maine. When the final Democratic break came, it came more as a result of Republican ineptness than Democratic Party planning.

It is ironical that the current period in the political history of Maine is the only really competitive period in its history. Earlier the state's political scene was marked by control by first the Democratic-Republicans, then the Democrats and finally, since its founding in 1854, the Republican Party.

There is no real evidence to suggest that the recent victory by an Independent governor will bring any major change to the current political balance. The Democrats, for the first time since the Civil War, are the leading party numerically. But that edge by no means assures the Democratic Party of any prospect of political domination.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Annual Register of Maine. Portland: Tower Publishing Company, 1837, 1841, 1843, 1845, 1852, 1855, 1856, 1870, 1872-1974.
- Bangor Daily News, November 9, 1978.
- Banks, Ronald F. Maine Becomes a State: The Movement to Separate Maine From Massachusetts, 1785-1820. Middleton: Wesleyan University Press, 1970.
- Barone, Michael, Grant Ujifusa, and Douglas Matthews. The Almanac of American Politics. Boston: Gambit Incorporated, 1972.
- Bean, Louis H. How America Votes in Presidential Elections. Metuchen: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1968.
- Berelson, Bernard R., Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee. Voting. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
- Bogue, Donald J. and Calvin L. Beale. Economic Areas of the United States. Glencoe: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.
- Brunelle, Jim, ed. Maine Almanac. Augusta: Guy Gannet Publishing Company, 1978.
- Bryan, Frank M. Yankee Politics in Rural Vermont. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1974.
- Burdick, Eugene and Arthur J. Brodbeck, eds. American Voting Behavior. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959.
- Burnham, Walter Dean. Critical Elections and the Mainsprings of American Politics. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1970.
- _____. Presidential Ballots, 1836-1892. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1955.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. Elections and the Political Order. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- _____. The American Voter. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

- Campbell, Angus, Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller. The Voter Decides. Evanston: Row, Peterson and Company, 1954.
- Chalmers, David M. Hooded Americanism: The First Century of the Ku Klux Klan, 1856-1956. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1965.
- Chambers, William N. and Walter D. Burnham. The American Party Systems, Stages of Political Development. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Clark, Charles E. Maine: A History. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1977.
- Coulter, Philip and Glen Gordon. Voting Behavior in Massachusetts. Amherst: Bureau of Government Research, 1967.
- Cox, Edward F. State and National Voting in Federal Elections, 1910-1970. Hamden: Shoe String Press, Inc., 1972.
- Crotty, William J., Donald M. Freeman, and Douglas S. Gatlin. Political Parties and Political Behavior. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1968.
- David, Paul T. Party Strength in the United States, 1872-1970. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1972.
- Donovan, John C. Congressional Campaign: Maine Elects a Democrat. New Jersey: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Dye, Thomas R. Politics in States and Communities. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Fenton, John H. and Donald W. Chamberlayne. "The Literature Dealing With the Relationships Between Political Processes, Socio-economic Conditions and Public Policies in the American States: A Bibliographical Essay." Polity 1 (1969): 388-404.
- Fenton, John H. People and Parties in Politics. Glenview: Scott Foresman and Company, 1966.
- _____. The Catholic Vote. New Orleans: The Hauser Press, Inc., 1960.
- Flanigan, William H. and Nancy H. Zingale. Political Behavior of the American Electorate. 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.

- Gaffney, Thomas L. "A Study of Maine Elections, 1930-1936." M.A. Thesis, University of Maine, 1968.
- Garland, Whitmore B. "The Right-To-Work Movement in Maine." M.A. Thesis, University of Maine, 1963.
- Goodman, Paul. The Democratic Republicans of Massachusetts: Politics in a Young Republic. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Goodwin, George, Jr. and Virginia Schuck, eds. Party Politics in the New England States. Durham: The New England Center For Continuing Education, 1968.
- Grindle, Roger L. Quarry and Kiln: The Story of Maine's Lime Industry. Rockland: Courier-Gazette, Inc., 1971.
- Guide to U. S. Elections, 1789-1974. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1975.
- Hatch, Louis C. Maine, A History. Somersworth: New Hampshire Publishing Company, 1974.
- Hebert, Richard A. Modern Maine: Its Historic Background, People, and Resources. Vol. 1. New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, Inc., 1951.
- Hesseltine, William B. Third Party Movements in the United States. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1962.
- Horan, James F., John C. Quinn, Kenneth T. Palmer, Allen C. Pease, and Eugene A. Mawhinney. Downeast Politics: The Government of the State of Maine. Dubuque: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company, 1975.
- Hutchinson, E. P. Immigrants and Their Children, 1850-1950. Census Monograph Series. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956.
- Isaacson, Dorris A., ed. Maine, A Guide 'Downeast.' 2nd ed. Rockland: Courier-Gazette, Inc., 1970.
- Jacob, Herbert and Michael Lepsky. "Outputs, Structures, and Power: An Assessment of Changes in the Study of State and Local Politics." The Journal of Politics. 30 (1968): 510-538.
- Jacob, Herbert and Kenneth N. Vines. Politics in the American States: A Comparative Analysis. 2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1971.

- Key, V. O., Jr. American State Politics: An Introduction. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.
- _____. A Primer of Statistics For Political Scientists. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Inc., 1966.
- _____. "A Theory of Critical Elections." Journal of Politics. 17 (1955): 3-18.
- _____. "Secular Realignment and the Party System." Journal of Politics 21 (1959): 198-210.
- Knoke, David. Change and Continuity in American Politics: The Social Basis of Political Parties. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.
- Ladd, Everett Carl. American Political Parties: Social Change and Political Response. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1970.
- Lancaster, Lane W. "The Democratic Party in Maine." National Municipal Review 18 (1929): 744-749.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul, Bernard R. Berelson and Hazel Gaudet. The People's Choice. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, ed. Emerging Coalitions in American Politics. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1978.
- Lockard, Duane. New England State Politics. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1968.
- Maine Department of Economic Development. Maine Pocket Data Book: An Economic Analysis. Augusta: Office of the Governor, 1969 and 1970.
- Maine Department of Labor and Industry. Census of Maine Manufactures. Augusta, 1966.
- Maine Sunday Telegram. 22 August, 1976.
- Mayhew, David R. Two-Party Competition in the New England States. Amherst: Bureau of Government Research, 1967.
- McCormick, Richard P. The Second American Party System: Party Formation in the Jacksonian Era. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1966.

- Nie, Norman H., Sidney Verba, and John R. Petrocik. The Changing American Voter. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Peterson, Svend. A Statistical History of American Presidential Elections. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1963.
- Pfeiffer, David G. "The Measurement of Inter-Party Competition and Systematic Stability." American Political Science Review 61 (1967): 457-467.
- Phillips, Kevin P. The Emerging Republican Majority. New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1970.
- Pierce, Neil R. The New England States: People, Politics, and Power in the Six New England States. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1976.
- Portland Evening Express, 22 July 1978.
- Portland Evening Express, 8 November 1978.
- Portland Press Herald, 19 July 1978.
- Portland Press Herald, 9 November 1978.
- Ranney, Austin and Willmoore Kendall. "The American Party Systems." American Political Science Review 48 (1954): 477-485.
- Ransone, Coleman B., Jr. The Office of Governor in the United States. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1965.
- Reiter, Howard L. "Who Voted for Longley? Maine Elects an Independent Governor." Paper presented at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Political Science Association, New Brunswick, N.J., November 13-15, 1975.
- Ring, Elizabeth. "The Progressive Movement of 1912 and Third Party Movement of 1924 in Maine." The Maine Bulletin. University of Maine Studies, Second Series, Orono: University of Maine, 26 (1933).
- Robinson, Edgar. They Voted For Roosevelt, The Presidential Vote, 1932-1944. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1947.
- _____. The Presidential Vote, 1896-1932. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1947.
- Rose, Richard, ed. Electoral Behavior: A Comparative Handbook. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

Rusk, Jerrold G. "The Effect of the Australian Ballot Reform on Split-Ticket Voting, 1876-1908." American Political Science Review 64 (1970): 1220-1238.

Scammon, Richard. America at the Rolls: The Vote for President, 1924-1964. Government Affairs Institute. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1965.

_____. America Votes. Vols. 1, 2. Government Affairs Institute. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1956, 1958.

_____. America Votes. Vols. 3, 4, 5. Government Affairs Institute. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1959, 1962, 1964.

_____. America Votes. Vols. 6-12. Government Affairs Institute. Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1966-1977.

Schattschneider, E. E. The Semisovereign People. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Schlesinger, Joseph. "A Two-Dimensional Scheme for Classifying States According to Degree of Inter-Party Competition." American Political Science Review 49 (1955): 1120-1128.

Schriver, Edward O. "Anti-Slavery: The Free Soil and Free Democratic Parties in Maine, 1848-1853." New England Quarterly 42 (1969): 82-94.

Scontras, Charles A. Two Decades of Organized Labor and Labor Politics in Maine, 1880-1900. Bureau of Labor Education. Orono: University of Maine Press, 1969.

Sibley, Joel H., Allan G. Bogue, and William H. Flanigan, eds. The History of American Electoral Behavior. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Smith, Lincoln. The Power Policy of Maine. Berkley: University of California Press, 1951.

Sprengel, Donald P., ed. Comparative State Politics, A Reader. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971.

State O' Maine Facts. Rockland: Courier-Gazette, Inc., 1976.

State of Maine, Office of Secretary of State. Number of Enrolled and Registered Voters With Comparative Gubernatorial and Presidential Votes. Augusta, 1960, 1962, 1968, 1970.

Sundquist, James L. Dynamics of the Party System: Alignment and Re-alignment of Political Parties in the United States. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1973.

The Lewiston (Maine) Daily Sun, 9 November 1978.

The Maine Handbook: A Statistical Abstract. Augusta: Maine Department of Economic Development, 1968.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. County and City Data Book. 1956.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. County and City Data Book. 1972.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957. 1960.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Pocket Data Book USA. 1976.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Religious Bodies: 1926. Vol. 1, 1930.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Religious Bodies: 1936. Vol. 1, 1941.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States. 1976.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Population: 1940. Vol. 1. Characteristics of the Population.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Population: 1950. Vol. 1. Characteristics of the Population.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Population: 1960. Vol. 1. Characteristics of the Population.

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Population: 1970. Vol. 1. Characteristics of the Population, Pt. 21, Maine.

Walker, David B. A Maine Profile: Some Conditioners of Her Political System. Government Research Series No. 25. Bureau for Research in Municipal Government. Brunswick: Bowdoin College, 1964.

_____. "The Presidential Politics of the Franco-American." Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science 28 (1962) 353-363.

Walker, Jack L. "Ballot Forms and Voter Fatigue: An Analysis of the Office Block and Party Column Ballots." Midwest Journal of Political Science 10 (1966): 448-463.

Weber, Edwin Waitstell. "An Evaluation of the Political History of the State of Maine, 1930-1940." M. A. Thesis, University of Maine, 1952.

Wescott, Richard R. "A History of Maine Politics, 1840-1850. The Formation of the Republican Party." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maine, 1966.

York, Robert M. "The Maine Elections of 1912." Maine Political Year-book. Augusta: The Maine Republican State Committee, 1962.

Zody, Richard E. and Norman R. Luttbeg. "An Evaluation of Various Measures of State Party Competition." Western Political Quarterly 21 (1968): 723-725.

APPENDIX A

County Socio-Economic and Election Data

<u>County</u>	% Foreign Born - 1940	% Foreign Born - 1960	% Foreign Born - 1970	% Foreign or Mixed Par. - 1960	% Foreign or Mixed Par. - 1970
Androscoggin	16.9	10.2	6.8	25.8	22.7
Aroostook	9.5	7.9	6.5	19.6	19.9
Cumberland	10.8	5.7	3.7	18.3	14.7
Franklin	6.5	3.9	3.0	11.7	10.1
Hancock	3.8	2.7	2.4	7.2	6.3
Kennebec	10.4	6.1	4.2	17.7	15.9
Knox	6.2	3.7	2.6	10.4	9.3
Lincoln	3.6	2.9	2.2	7.3	8.2
Oxford	11.1	6.4	3.9	16.0	14.4
Penobscot	7.9	5.0	3.3	14.9	12.6
Piscataquis	9.2	6.0	3.9	14.5	13.3
Sagadahoc	6.9	4.5	2.8	12.5	11.2
Somerset	8.3	5.8	4.3	14.1	12.3
Waldo	3.3	2.2	1.8	7.5	6.9
Washington	6.9	7.1	5.0	14.9	14.0
York	13.6	7.7	5.4	21.5	18.1
State	00.0	6.2	4.3	17.1	15.1

<u>County</u>	% in Manufacturing 1950	% in Manufacturing 1960	% in Manufacturing 1970	% White Collar Occup. - 1960	% White Collar Occup. - 1970
Androscoggin	52.4	49.0	41.4	30.8	34.8
Aroostook	11.4	14.7	21.5	34.6	37.1
Cumberland	25.0	23.3	22.0	44.2	50.2
Franklin	47.8	48.1	49.4	25.4	34.9
Hancock	21.6	20.9	19.2	34.8	40.2
Kennebec	35.4	31.2	26.2	38.6	45.2
Knox	25.4	26.3	26.7	33.4	38.8
Lincoln	20.6	26.1	22.1	31.1	37.3
Oxford	52.0	51.8	48.3	28.0	31.8
Penobscot	29.8	30.7	26.8	40.1	45.1
Piscataquis	35.9	41.9	43.3	29.4	31.8
Sagadahoc	40.3	41.5	39.4	30.6	42.2
Somerset	40.9	46.3	47.3	26.2	30.2
Waldo	23.0	31.0	32.8	27.9	29.1
Washington	32.2	31.9	31.2	30.3	33.2
York	51.4	43.3	44.2	31.3	36.8
State	34.2	33.2	31.6	35.4	40.7

<u>County</u>	Median Family Inc. 1960	Median Family Inc. 1970	% Urban - 1960	% Urban - 1970	Median Age - 1950
Androscoggin	5,113	8,273	82.0	75.0	30.7
Aroostook	4,093	6,929	38.3	49.4	25.3
Cumberland	5,477	9,289	67.9	62.7	31.3
Franklin	4,384	7,993	13.7	13.8	29.3
Hancock	4,176	7,607	13.8	13.3	33.1
Kennebec	5,101	8,853	60.7	60.5	31.0
Knox	4,371	7,362	43.0	41.4	34.5
Lincoln	4,177	7,847	00.0	00.0	34.1
Oxford	5,078	8,060	31.2	21.9	29.8
Penobscot	5,102	8,301	61.9	61.4	28.4
Piscataquis	4,383	7,220	00.0	19.0	31.7
Sagadahoc	5,281	8,112	47.0	52.8	31.9
Somerset	4,657	7,516	41.3	40.8	30.1
Waldo	3,995	7,510	27.1	25.5	31.1
Washington	3,505	6,137	20.5	13.5	31.1
York	5,088	8,495	56.3	56.3	30.5
State	4,873	8,205	51.3	50.8	30.0

<u>County</u>	Median Age - 1960	Median Age - 1970	% Foreign Stock 1960	% Foreign Stock 1970	Median School Years Completed - 1950
Androscoggin	31.0	28.9	36.0	29.4	8.8
Aroostook	22.7	24.3	27.5	26.4	8.7
Cumberland	31.0	28.9	24.0	18.4	11.2
Franklin	29.0	26.8	15.6	13.1	10.4
Hancock	33.2	32.2	9.9	9.3	10.6
Kennebec	31.2	29.3	23.8	20.0	10.3
Knox	35.0	34.2	14.1	12.0	10.5
Lincoln	34.1	34.6	10.2	10.4	11.0
Oxford	30.5	30.1	22.4	18.3	10.1
Penobscot	26.5	25.7	19.9	15.9	10.8
Piscataquis	32.6	32.7	20.5	17.1	10.4
Sagadahoc	30.5	28.8	17.0	14.1	10.5
Somerset	30.0	29.4	19.9	16.6	9.3
Waldo	29.4	28.6	9.7	8.7	10.5
Washington	32.5	33.4	22.0	19.0	10.0
York	31.2	28.7	29.2	23.5	9.5
State	29.5	28.6	23.3	19.4	10.2

<u>County</u>	Median School Years Completed - 1970	Family Income - % Over \$10,000 - 1960	Family Income - % Over \$10,000 - 1970	% Catholic - 1926	% Catholic - 1936
Androscoggin	11.1	7.5	7.3	77.4	78.8
Aroostook	11.5	5.5	6.0	76.8	79.5
Cumberland	12.4	11.0	13.0	50.7	50.3
Franklin	12.2	4.9	8.0	46.4	55.5
Hancock	12.2	5.0	7.8	11.3	20.8
Kennebec	12.2	8.5	11.6	60.0	64.2
Knox	12.2	4.9	6.7	13.1	13.6
Lincoln	12.3	5.5	8.2	11.1	13.8
Oxford	12.1	8.0	6.4	60.4	61.9
Penobscot	12.2	8.7	10.0	58.6	57.1
Piscataquis	12.1	5.1	4.7	30.5	29.0
Sagadahoc	12.2	9.1	8.6	31.7	33.8
Somerset	11.6	5.5	6.6	64.3	60.4
Waldo	12.0	3.7	7.4	20.6	25.1
Washington	11.5	3.6	5.4	29.3	32.4
York	12.1	7.7	9.5	69.8	71.3
State	12.1	7.7	9.2	59.1	61.2

<u>County</u>	Changed % in Manufacturing 1960-1970	Changed % Urban 1960-1970	Changed Foreign Stock 1960-1970	Population Change 1960-1970
Androscoggin	-7.6	-7.0	-6.6	5.8
Aroostook	6.8	11.1	-1.1	-12.8
Cumberland	-1.3	-5.2	-5.6	5.3
Franklin	1.6	0.1	-2.5	11.8
Hancock	-1.7	-0.5	-0.6	7.1
Kennebec	-5.0	-0.2	-3.8	6.8
Knox	0.4	-1.6	-2.1	1.5
Lincoln	-4.0	0.0	0.2	11.0
Oxford	-3.5	-9.3	-4.1	-2.0
Penobscot	-3.9	-0.5	-4.0	-0.8
Piscataquis	1.4	19.0	-3.4	-6.3
Sagadahoc	2.1	5.8	-2.9	2.9
Somerset	1.0	-0.5	-3.3	2.1
Waldo	1.8	-1.6	-1.0	3.1
Washington	-0.7	-7.0	-3.0	-9.3
York	0.9	0.5	-5.7	12.2
State	-1.6	-0.5	-3.9	2.4

<u>County</u>	'52 Presidential	'52 Senator	'52 Governor	'54 Senator	'54 Governor
Androscoggin	49.3	51.7	53.3	51.8	62.1
Aroostook	31.0	27.6	29.3	39.9	60.1
Cumberland	30.7	35.1	37.9	38.7	49.6
Franklin	26.6	26.7	27.3	34.0	45.4
Hancock	16.6	21.6	23.6	27.0	46.0
Kennebec	36.4	40.2	40.5	42.4	57.2
Knox	21.5	27.8	27.3	26.9	40.5
Lincoln	16.1	20.8	20.1	22.7	35.9
Oxford	33.2	36.4	36.9	39.6	53.2
Penobscot	31.3	32.1	37.1	42.2	57.5
Piscataquis	32.7	34.8	37.0	39.7	55.5
Sagadahoc	33.0	39.7	40.1	38.3	51.3
Somerset	32.9	40.8	41.0	40.7	57.0
Waldo	19.5	30.1	28.2	32.2	53.7
Washington	34.0	26.1	28.3	41.2	57.2
York	43.1	46.7	48.8	51.4	56.9
State	33.8	37.3	33.4	41.4	54.5

<u>County</u>	'56 Presidential	'56 Governor	'58 Senator	'58 Governor	'60 Presidential
Androscoggin	43.7	69.2	75.7	69.3	64.0
Aroostook	27.6	59.0	56.9	46.6	44.2
Cumberland	28.1	58.4	61.4	51.7	41.5
Franklin	21.0	55.9	60.2	47.9	35.0
Hancock	13.1	44.6	42.4	33.0	21.7
Kennebec	33.3	64.4	64.2	54.7	45.7
Knox	18.7	52.1	51.2	41.6	29.6
Lincoln	13.9	43.1	41.0	32.5	23.6
Oxford	27.0	59.3	62.6	53.8	43.3
Penobscot	23.6	57.3	57.8	49.8	40.3
Piscataquis	22.4	58.2	57.4	47.4	36.6
Sagadahoc	27.1	57.9	60.7	50.2	38.3
Somerset	28.2	58.4	61.5	52.8	40.7
Waldo	17.4	53.0	52.8	42.4	29.4
Washington	23.8	55.9	54.1	46.0	34.1
York	30.0	61.4	63.5	56.6	50.4
State	29.1	59.2	60.8	52.0	43.0

<u>County</u>	'60 Senator	'60 Governor	'62 Governor	'64 Presidential	'64 Senator
Androscoggin	56.9	68.6	67.6	80.2	78.9
Aroostook	39.9	42.9	44.4	63.7	60.5
Cumberland	37.1	47.8	48.4	69.5	69.1
Franklin	30.0	42.1	42.0	66.7	64.9
Hancock	19.1	26.2	35.2	54.0	47.4
Kennebec	40.6	50.6	49.1	68.7	67.9
Knox	25.2	37.3	38.6	61.5	61.5
Lincoln	20.5	32.0	34.9	56.1	56.7
Oxford	41.0	49.2	50.7	71.8	68.7
Penobscot	36.4	43.6	49.1	66.6	62.2
Piscataquis	30.3	38.6	42.9	65.9	60.5
Sagadahoc	32.5	46.5	49.4	71.9	70.0
Somerset	36.1	44.8	48.2	70.2	66.1
Waldo	27.9	34.3	43.8	61.9	58.4
Washington	31.7	37.8	49.9	70.9	64.5
York	44.3	53.0	56.9	71.9	70.4
State	38.4	47.3	49.9	68.8	66.6

<u>County</u>	'66 Senator	'66 Governor	'68 Presidential	'70 Senator	'70 Governor
Androscoggin	59.5	68.0	72.1	75.9	64.3
Aroostook	43.8	48.9	51.9	62.8	51.7
Cumberland	40.3	51.5	58.1	63.7	53.0
Franklin	31.3	48.2	51.1	57.4	46.1
Hancock	22.2	41.3	35.8	46.9	31.0
Kennebec	40.6	49.0	57.6	59.6	50.5
Knox	29.1	45.6	43.7	50.8	37.7
Lincoln	25.1	39.9	37.4	44.0	33.3
Oxford	44.2	55.8	57.5	60.7	50.9
Penobscot	39.8	54.0	54.9	62.7	50.8
Piscataquis	32.7	52.9	52.7	60.4	46.6
Sagadahoc	36.3	50.5	57.4	60.8	49.3
Somerset	40.4	52.6	55.3	58.5	43.7
Waldo	32.3	47.8	42.3	46.3	35.4
Washington	37.5	54.4	53.1	56.4	42.9
York	44.4	57.9	60.4	65.5	52.7
State	41.4	53.1	56.2	61.7	50.1

<u>County</u>	'72 Presidential	'72 Senator	Average Dem. Vote	% Change Vote All Elections
Androscoggin	50.1	65.9	63.6	15.1
Aroostook	37.6	56.2	46.7	18.3
Cumberland	39.4	54.1	48.4	18.7
Franklin	33.4	50.6	42.9	19.1
Hancock	26.1	40.7	32.5	14.1
Kennebec	40.0	53.1	50.4	10.1
Knox	29.3	41.3	38.2	16.0
Lincoln	27.7	36.7	32.5	18.1
Oxford	35.5	54.0	49.3	15.6
Penobscot	38.1	59.0	44.9	18.1
Piscataquis	35.3	54.3	45.2	13.7
Sagadahoc	34.6	41.0	47.1	10.9
Somerset	37.0	58.4	48.4	12.0
Waldo	31.2	44.0	39.3	12.0
Washington	32.4	49.0	44.5	16.0
York	42.5	48.5	53.9	6.5
State	38.5	53.2	48.6	16.6

<u>County</u>	% Change Vote Pres. Elections	% Change Vote Governors Elections	% Change Vote Senators Elections
Androscoggin	15.1	8.4	16.1
Aroostook	17.9	4.4	24.7
Cumberland	23.1	6.8	18.9
Franklin	22.3	8.2	19.4
Hancock	21.1	-0.6	16.7
Kennebec	16.3	-1.8	11.1
Knox	21.2	4.5	15.6
Lincoln	23.0	-1.1	17.2
Oxford	18.8	6.7	16.8
Penobscot	22.0	4.0	21.9
Piscataquis	19.6	-0.1	16.3
Sagadahoc	18.9	2.6	7.2
Somerset	18.8	-3.5	14.9
Waldo	23.7	-1.2	11.4
Washington	16.7	5.2	18.3
York	12.2	1.3	3.2
State	18.7	6.4	15.3

APPENDIX B

Voter Registration By County 1958-1974

Androscoggin County

<u>Year</u>	<u>REV-P</u>	<u>DEV-P</u>	<u>IND.</u>	<u>RV-GE</u>
1958	13,547	18,520	10,761	42,828
1960	12,627	19,381	14,537	46,545
1962	12,072	20,563	11,855	44,490
1966	11,937	22,345	11,155	45,437
1968	11,239	22,790	12,945	46,974
1970	11,397	24,950	10,721	47,068
1972	13,180	26,044	13,854	53,078
1974	12,651	27,504	13,826	53,981

Aroostook County

1958	22,164	9,223	11,087	42,474
1960	22,189	10,552	15,738	48,479
1962	20,882	12,271	9,719	42,872
1966	19,717	13,327	8,895	41,939
1968	18,824	12,241	12,235	43,300
1970	18,277	14,656	5,774	38,707
1972	17,857	16,568	14,218	48,643
1974	17,878	19,220	12,778	49,876

Cumberland County

<u>Year</u>	<u>REV-P</u>	<u>DEV-P</u>	<u>IND.</u>	<u>RV-GE</u>
1958	46,509	16,275	22,926	85,710
1960	43,574	16,767	36,863	97,204
1962	46,184	20,925	19,808	86,917
1966	45,251	24,586	23,879	93,716
1968	44,182	25,840	30,538	100,560
1970	44,074	27,434	30,008	101,516
1972	48,678	31,693	43,175	123,546
1974	48,949	37,551	40,860	127,360

Franklin County

1958	6,250	2,508	3,685	12,443
1960	6,129	2,381	4,322	12,832
1962	5,991	3,037	3,363	12,391
1966	5,957	3,257	2,414	11,628
1968	6,082	3,263	2,633	11,978
1970	5,714	3,379	2,602	11,695
1972	5,873	3,631	4,144	13,648
1974	6,360	4,356	3,407	14,123

Hancock County

<u>Year</u>	<u>REV-P</u>	<u>DEV-P</u>	<u>IND.</u>	<u>RV-GE</u>
1958	12,427	2,562	5,099	20,088
1960	12,607	2,628	6,266	21,501
1962	12,240	2,745	5,594	20,579
1966	12,084	3,354	4,647	20,085
1968	12,076	3,473	5,061	20,610
1970	12,498	3,709	4,325	20,532
1972	13,082	4,092	6,507	23,681
1974	13,515	4,939	6,408	24,862

Kennebec County

1958	26,329	9,005	8,668	44,002
1960	24,504	10,093	14,058	48,655
1962	24,357	11,580	10,067	46,004
1966	24,261	13,922	8,502	46,685
1968	22,954	14,073	11,268	48,295
1970	22,798	15,103	11,056	48,957
1972	24,207	17,604	15,472	57,283
1974	23,695	20,210	16,593	60,498

Knox County

<u>Year</u>	<u>REV-P</u>	<u>DEV-P</u>	<u>IND.</u>	<u>RV-GE</u>
1958	7,751	2,932	5,572	16,255
1960	7,845	3,137	6,110	17,092
1962	8,101	3,136	4,973	16,210
1966	8,182	3,430	4,447	16,059
1968	8,038	3,551	4,720	16,309
1970	8,028	3,585	4,492	16,105
1972	8,572	3,893	5,996	18,461
1974	8,339	4,242	6,262	18,843

Lincoln County

1958	9,039	1,397	1,911	12,347
1960	8,321	1,535	2,598	12,954
1962	8,283	1,811	1,884	11,978
1966	8,104	2,103	2,853	13,060
1968	7,754	2,154	3,352	13,260
1970	7,724	2,203	3,079	13,006
1972	8,098	2,624	4,257	14,979
1974	8,493	2,922	4,335	15,750

Oxford County

<u>Year</u>	<u>REV-P</u>	<u>DEV-P</u>	<u>IND.</u>	<u>RV-GE</u>
1958	10,463	5,676	8,730	24,869
1960	10,097	6,002	10,830	26,929
1962	9,614	7,302	8,264	25,180
1966	9,942	9,545	6,664	26,171
1968	9,494	9,582	7,260	26,336
1970	9,350	9,728	6,379	25,457
1972	9,478	10,519	8,816	28,813
1974	9,397	10,611	8,258	28,466

Penobscot County

1958	30,450	10,561	10,270	51,281
1960	29,728	11,597	20,587	61,912
1962	30,826	14,168	11,554	56,548
1966	28,681	17,429	13,168	59,278
1968	27,435	18,869	15,607	61,774
1970	26,278	19,567	13,894	59,739
1972	29,153	23,711	19,848	72,712
1974	28,433	24,978	19,433	72,844

Piscataquis County

<u>Year</u>	<u>REV-P</u>	<u>DEV-P</u>	<u>IND.</u>	<u>RV-GE</u>
1958	5,987	2,105	1,142	9,234
1960	6,287	2,197	2,161	10,645
1962	5,881	2,174	1,227	9,282
1966	5,512	2,870	1,491	9,873
1968	5,081	2,684	1,592	9,357
1970	4,900	2,696	1,990	9,586
1972	5,062	3,141	2,884	10,987
1974	5,051	3,593	2,654	11,298

Sagadahoc County

1958	6,718	2,016	2,703	11,437
1960	7,366	2,458	2,765	12,589
1962	7,043	2,796	1,870	11,709
1966	6,421	4,008	1,801	12,230
1968	5,715	3,782	3,080	12,577
1970	5,861	4,130	2,384	12,375
1972	6,141	4,384	3,574	14,099
1974	6,090	4,606	4,288	14,984

Somerset County

<u>Year</u>	<u>REV-P</u>	<u>DEV-P</u>	<u>IND.</u>	<u>RV-GE</u>
1958	11,699	6,181	3,422	21,302
1960	10,980	6,003	4,857	21,840
1962	9,763	5,756	5,361	20,880
1966	9,412	7,154	6,207	21,773
1968	9,184	7,232	6,443	22,859
1970	8,932	7,483	6,325	22,740
1972	9,362	8,040	8,281	25,683
1974	9,212	8,747	7,517	25,476

Waldo County

1958	7,507	2,191	1,766	11,464
1960	7,011	2,263	2,975	12,249
1962	7,192	2,644	1,811	11,647
1966	6,407	3,633	2,089	12,129
1968	6,573	3,094	2,583	12,250
1970	6,666	3,132	2,512	12,360
1972	6,862	3,579	3,985	14,426
1974	6,958	3,882	4,434	15,274

Washington County

<u>Year</u>	<u>REV-P</u>	<u>DEV-P</u>	<u>IND.</u>	<u>RV-GE</u>
1958	11,810	3,630	3,204	18,644
1960	11,751	3,722	4,370	19,843
1962	10,904	4,119	3,495	18,518
1966	9,400	5,424	3,553	18,377
1968	10,672	6,264	1,536	18,472
1970	8,789	5,886	3,274	17,949
1972	8,682	6,183	4,475	19,341
1974	8,633	6,479	4,335	19,447

York County

1958	23,793	17,284	18,420	59,497
1960	25,798	18,332	22,523	66,653
1962	22,115	18,961	19,728	60,824
1966	22,131	21,192	18,125	61,448
1968	21,896	21,527	20,803	64,226
1970	21,817	22,845	19,590	64,252
1972	25,238	25,125	25,803	76,166
1974	24,114	26,135	26,542	76,791

REV-P is Republican Enrolled Voters - Primary
DEV-P is Democratic Enrolled Voters - Primary
IND. is Independents
RV-GE is Registered Voters - General Election

Source: Office of Secretary of State

